THEOLOGY

A Monthly Journal of Historic Christianity

Edited by the Rev. E. G. Selwyn, B.D., Redhill Rectory, Havant, to whom all editorial matters should be addressed.

Vol. XIII DECEMBER, 1926 No. 78

EDITORIAL

The year now drawing to a close has been one of the most difficult and distressing within living memory, so far as the condition of our own country has been concerned. The General Strike may be regarded as no more than a momentary folly, which passed swiftly so soon as its far-reaching issues were envisaged. But the stubborn industrial dispute which lay behind it, and has so long outlived it, has revealed a more deep-seated, and therefore more menacing, disorder in the national mind—an almost complete conflict of motives and ends, of interests and principles, amongst those who carry on a large part of the productive work of the country. We have scarcely begun yet to reap the consequences of this conflict, though the fact that, humanly speaking, shortage of coal was largely the cause of the loss of many gallant lives on *H.M.S. Valerian* is an indication of how widely they ramify. To those who have ears to hear, the Advent warnings will come this year with especial impressiveness, revealing as they do the "abiding consequences" (to quote von Hügel's phrase) of all wrong-doing and the true objects alike of fear and of hope. For the true object of fear is not the impoverishment (though that is serious enough), but the blindness, which follows upon the pursuit of selfish ends; and the true object of hope not prosperity but richness of soul. There is, in the Museum at Dijon, a great work of sculpture by Rude, the French master of the middle of the last century, entitled "Napoleon Awaking to Immortality." It shows the Man of Destiny, whose idol was glory, recumbent on a couch, with head slightly raised, as of one who wakes from sleep; and on his face, still expressive of its native pride, there is dawning also something new—a look of baffled surprise, of unexpectedness, almost of hope. It is through some such crisis that the mind of our own country must pass—perhaps is preparing now to pass—if it is still to be a strong and Christian land; so that from the recognition of Christ as Judge it may come to confess Him with a new sincerity as King.

ST. PAUL'S THEORY OF REDEMPTION

DESPITE the centuries which have elapsed since the death of Christ on Calvary, it is still not possible to say that there is any one universally accepted and orthodox doctrine of exactly how that death is efficacious for the salvation of man. Various theories have been advanced and have received more or less general acceptance. It will perhaps clear the way for a consideration of St. Paul's doctrine of redemption if at the outset it is made plain that he, at least, could never have accepted for a moment either one of two theories which have at times been widely held by Christians.

First of all, in view of his general teaching about God, it is impossible to believe that St. Paul thought of Christ as reconciling God to man, as soothing, by His offering of Himself, a God who was alienated and hostile because of human sin. Occasionally, it is true, he does use sacrificial language with regard to Christ. But it is doubtful how far such language is to be taken literally, and it is also, apparently, doubted by Old Testament scholars whether the essential idea underlying Jewish sacrifice was that of propitiation or that of communion. It is unsafe, therefore, when there is such scope for doubt, to build a theory of propitiation on a hard and fast, literal interpretation of St. Paul's comparatively few sacrificial passages. Further, in the most striking of them all, where Christ is definitely spoken of as ἱλαστήριον (Rom. iii. 25), whatever may be the exact meaning of that word, the one thing which is made clear is that it is God who was the originator of the saving work of Christ: it was God who "set Him forth" to be propitiatory. Moreover, that is the point of view which is usual in St. Paul. All through his letters, God is regarded as at least co-operating in, if not as actually initiating, the work of man's salvation. It was He who sent His own Son (Rom. viii. 3), who spared not His own son (Rom. viii. 32), who commendeth His own love towards us in the death of Christ (Rom. v. 8). It was He who was in Christ reconciling the world to Himself (2 Cor. v. 19). In keeping with this, St. Paul does not ever speak of God as becoming reconciled to us, but rather of our need to be reconciled to Him: the hostility is on our side, not on God's. "Let us have peace towards God" (Rom. v. 1). "We beseech you . . . be ye reconciled to God" (2 Cor. v. 20. Compare 2 Cor. v. 18, Rom. v. 10). Although there is no justification in St. Paul's epistles for any view which would suggest any attitude towards sin on the part of God other than that of sheer opposition, yet

towards men, in spite of sin, His attitude is, throughout, conceived as one of love. (In Rom. i. 30, the context itself no less than St. Paul's general teaching necessitates that θεοστυγεῖς be translated "haters of God" rather than "hateful to God"; it occurs in the middle of a list of adjectives which practically all suggest active ill-doing or ill-feeling rather than passive bad qualities.) In a word, with St. Paul's usual doctrine of God, there is no possibility or need of His being propitiated, as that term is usually understood—of His being soothed and turned from an enemy into a friend. On the contrary, He is at the back of all good which comes to men: His attitude is supremely benevolent.

There are, it is true, a few passages which at first sight seem to contradict this usual conception of the love of God, and to suggest that even St. Paul at times thought of the Father as in need of mollification. Such, for example, is the mention, especially frequent in Romans, of the ὀργή of God. But to look at the passages closely is to see at once that "the wrath of God," to St. Paul, has nothing of passion or heat in it. In several cases the phrase seems to be hardly more than a synonym for the coming Judgment when the wicked are to be punished (*e.g.*, 1 Thess. i. 10; Rom. ii. 5, iii. 9, v. 9). And even where the "wrath" is not thus, as it were, externalized into punishment, but is still conceived as a quality of God, what it means is simply the unchanging and eternal opposition of God towards evil, which is to take effect in action at the Day of Judgment. Against such wrath, clearly, the putting away of sin is an adequate remedy. Nowhere is it suggested that God's honour has been impugned or that His ruffled feelings have to be calmed. In a word, "the wrath of God," as St. Paul uses the words, does not really at all contradict the general conception of complete divine benevolence. And there is only one other passage which the present writer could find which might be taken as implying unfriendliness on God's part. It is Rom. viii. 34, where Christ is said to be at the right hand of God, making intercession for us. Apart from the sacrificial language, it is the only passage which can fairly be quoted from St. Paul in support of the theory that the work of Christ was to reconcile God to man. Alone, it does not seem to be an adequate basis for such a theory, especially as it can be explained in a way which requires no such theory (see below). In a word, therefore, we may say that any theory which regards Christ as propitiating an angry God, or as "satisfying" Him, is not compatible with St. Paul's general conception of God nor required by his language.

Equally certainly, in the second place, St. Paul would have rejected the theory, held subsequently, that Christ ransomed

us from the devil by paying to him a price—namely, His death upon the Cross. Not only is there no hint of any such teaching in any of the Pauline writings, but it is quite contrary to his whole outlook. He has an almost overwhelming sense of the supremacy of God and of Christ over all other spiritual beings and powers (Eph. i. 21; Col. i. 16). They are subject to Christ, and have been overcome. It is inconceivable that St. Paul could ever have thought of them as being, so to speak, on an equality with Christ and as having some right over man which had to be bought in by God with the payment of a price. To St. Paul, so far as evil spirits had obtained power over men, it was usurped and not legitimate: Christ had put an end to it not by bargaining with demons but by beating them.

And yet, despite all this, St. Paul does constantly speak of men as having been bought by Christ, and even of a price having been paid. If we have been bought neither from the devil nor from a vengeful God, then how were we bought and from what or whom? That is the problem to be faced.

So far as our literary evidence goes, though it is admittedly very far from adequate, St. Paul seems to have been the first of the early Christians to grasp the central and supreme importance of the Cross. Such a statement can only be made very tentatively; for what we call Paulinism may very well be, in fact, simply the ordinary Christianity of his day. But it is indisputable that in the early speeches in the Acts, the Cross is not represented as the central fact on which salvation depends. It rather appears as something which calls for justification or apology. St. Peter is at pains to show that it did not upset the purposes of God (Acts ii. 23), and that it did not prove the wickedness of Christ but rather of His opponents (Acts ii. 23, iii. 13-15). The Cross is here rather a matter for explanation than for exultation. But in St. Paul the Cross is throughout, as it were, the throne of Christ's glory. Apparently from the outset, with the intuition of religious genius, St. Paul, like the second Isaiah, grasped the remedial, salutary, and vicarious effect of suffering. Even in the earliest of his letters, the death of Christ is not regarded as merely fulfilling a prophecy or as the result of the machinations of evil men; it was definitely on our behalf—ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν—somehow profitable for our salvation (1 Thess. v. 9). There is no theory given as to how the death could have saving efficacy; merely the fact is stated. St. Paul seems to assume that others equally with himself will grasp immediately that the Cross is central and final, and he is content simply to remind them of it. Such references to the Cross are frequent in his writings, coming at times almost by the way, as though its value for man was so obvious to St. Paul as not even to need any explanation. We

are to avoid causing offence to the weaker brother; Christ died for him (1 Cor. viii. 11; *cf.* Rom. xiv. 15, "him for whom Christ died"). The Christian can ever march serenely on, confident in the love of God, for even while we were sinners Christ died for us (Rom. v. 6, 8). The whole inspiration of St. Paul's own life and work is that the Son of God loved him and gave Himself for him (Gal. ii. 20). In those and similar passages (2 Cor. v. 14; Gal. i. 4) no theory is offered; but the conviction that the sufferings of Christ were for us is so firmly held as to be the premise for further argument or exhortation.

Probably that conviction was reached by St. Paul intuitively, and not by logical process; his heart first grasped the meaning of the Cross before he turned his mind to the working out of a rationale of salvation. For the unexplained conviction is to be found in Thessalonians, whereas the explanation of how salvation comes through the Cross does not begin to appear until the central group of letters, to which Galatians may be provisionally assigned.* Is it fanciful to suggest that it was the failure, bitterly felt (1 Cor. ii. 1-5), of his preaching at Athens which led him to concentrate on the preaching of the Cross, and to think out a teaching of it which would appeal to the head as well as to the heart? When he reached Corinth, he "determined to know nothing save Christ Jesus and Him crucified" (1 Cor. ii. 2), and to the Galatians, he claims, it was "Christ crucified" who was publicly proclaimed (Gal. iii. 1).

But along with this emphasis on the Cross there now appears the idea that somehow Christ has *bought* us, an idea which is prominent henceforward to the end of St. Paul's writings. We are not our own, we have been bought with a price (1 Cor. vi. 20, vii. 23); Christ "was made unto us . . . redemption" (1 Cor. i. 30); "redemption" is in Christ Jesus (Rom. iii. 24; Eph.

* The date of Galatians is an unsolved problem. In general outlook and in subject-matter it seems clearly to belong to the same period as Romans. But it has been urged that it must have been written prior to the Jerusalem Council of Acts xv., for (1) if the decision of that Council about circumcision had already been made when he wrote, St. Paul must have mentioned it; and (2) if the Council had already taken place, St. Paul could not have claimed so strongly as he does that his message was direct from God and not mediated to him through the other apostles. Neither argument is very convincing. Admittedly 1 Corinthians is subsequent to the Council, and yet in it St. Paul does deal at great length with a point on which the Council had pronounced—the subject of idol-meats—without referring to its decision, which seems to dispose of the first argument above. The second is surely due to a misunderstanding. It was sufficient for St. Paul to show that, on his *first visit* to Galatia, when he had been accepted by his hearers as possessing full authority, he had not received his gospel from men, but direct from God. It was therefore enough for him to describe his meetings with the apostles down to the time of his first journey, and the lack of reference to the Council does not in the least prove that it had not occurred. It therefore seems safer to assign the Galatian epistle to the central group of letters to which it is in every way akin, rather than to place it as the earliest writing in the New Testament, which must be done if it is supposed that the Jerusalem Council had not taken place when it was written.

i. 7; Col. i. 14); He was sent to buy out those under the law (Gal. iv. 5). It is possible to suggest that in such passages the idea of buying is merely a metaphor and should not be pressed. Certainly in Ephesians (i. 13, 14, iv. 30) " redemption " is used without any apparent emphasis on a transaction or the payment of a price, and seems merely to mean vindication. But the idea of redemption is so frequent in St. Paul that it is hard to suppose that it is always to be taken metaphorically, nor should we allow ourselves to be induced to take it so because in our modern way of speech " redeem " has become a mere synonym for " save." There is no real reason to suppose that such a usage was common in St. Paul's day or to St. Paul himself. The Septuagint, for example, only uses ἀπολύτρωσις once, and ἀπολυτροῦν twice. Further, there is in St. Paul a good deal to suggest that he did think of a definite price being paid for our redemption, and *that it was paid to the Law.* In Galatians (iv. 5) we are told that Christ was sent to buy out those who were under the Law: even more explicit is Gal. iii. 13, " Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law, having become a curse for us," where the subsequent words make it clear that the price He paid was the Cross, on which He paid the penalty due under the Law to human sins. The same idea is expressed in 2 Cor. v. 21, " Him who knew no sin He made to be sin on our behalf," and even more clearly in Col. ii. 14, " having blotted out the bond written in ordinances that was against us [*i.e.*, the Jews] . . . and He hath taken it out of the way nailing it to the cross," which surely can only mean that on the Cross He bore the penalty due to man according to the Law, so that man is now free of it. Cumulatively, these passages give a strong impression that St. Paul thought of the Jews as under the Law and therefore, through their sins, subject to the penalties involved in the breach of the Law, but that Christ has borne those penalties—that is the price He paid on the Cross—so that now those who accept His work are free from the penalties of the Law, and indeed from all its claims. For the point of Col. ii. 14 is precisely that that which separated Jews from Gentiles (*i.e.*, the Law) has been done away in Christ.

To the modern reader, such an idea seems at first sight merely chimerical. The Law was God's Law: surely He could change it or abolish it at will if He thought good. It is merely childish to think of God as working, and of Christ as suffering, to fulfil the claims of the Law in order that men might freely be forgiven. Such an idea, however, though bizarre to us, was very far from impossible for a Jew of St. Paul's day. The process of exalting the Law had been carried very far. In the book of Jubilees, for example, the laws of the Sabbath, of the Feast of Weeks,

of Circumcision, are regarded as being observed in heaven by the angels; and various commandments—*e.g.*, that of abstinence from blood—are "for ever." Dr. Montifiore (*Paul and Judaism*, p. 26) speaks of the Rabbinic Jews looking to the Law as "perfect and immutable," "the most precious gift" of God. Mr. St. John Thackeray (*The Relation of St. Paul to Contemporary Jewish Thought*, p. 60) writes of the contemporary Jewish view of the Law that "God Himself, it was said, fulfils the Law, and no day passes on which He does not promulgate a new Halacha (or ruling on some disputed point in the Law) in the Council above. It is the unique expression of God's will." In view of such contemporary estimates of the Law, it is surely not inconceivable that St. Paul also thought of the Law as the immutable utterance of God, valid until its claims had been satisfied. Moreover, we are not left to conjecture: a careful reading of the epistles shows definitely that, in fact, St. Paul had the very highest respect for the Law. In itself, "the law is holy, and the commandment holy, and righteous, and good" (Rom. vii. 12); the possession of the "oracles of God" was the foremost advantage of the Jews (Rom. iii. 2). The carrying out of its behests is profitable (Rom. ii. 25), and his own conscience approves of its commandments (Rom. vii. 22); while the mere suggestion that it is sin (Rom. vii. 7) or opposed to the promises of God (Gal. iii. 21) fills him with horror. Those Gentiles who, not having the Law, yet do the things of the Law, are highly praised (Rom. ii. 14); while even Christians, though no longer subject to the Law, yet in the spirit fulfil its ordinances (Rom. viii. 4). The disadvantage of the Law was that although it set up so high and pure a standard, it offered man no help in attaining it; but that was a fault not in the Law but in men (Rom. viii. 3, vii. 14). The first effect of the Law was wholly good: it roused in men the consciousness of sin (Rom. iii. 20, vii. 13). True, the result of that was often to provoke man to sin (Rom. vii. 7, 9). But again the fault lay in man, not in the Law. It was not the intention of the Law that this should happen: "the commandment was unto life" (Rom. vii. 10). One passage, if it stood alone, "the law came in that trespass might abound" (Rom. v. 20), could possibly be taken to mean that the purpose of the Law was to provoke man to sin—as, in effect, St. Paul declared it did. But in view of what he says elsewhere both about God and about the Law, it is hardly possible to suppose that that is what he meant. Surely, rather, his meaning is that the Law was given that "trespass" might abound; that is, that unconscious ἁμαρτία should become known in its true character of "trespass," with its accompanying sense of guilt. So was the Law a pedagogue to lead men to Christ (Gal. iii. 24).

It is important, if we are to understand St. Paul aright, to grasp the fact that his veneration for the Law was as great as that of his Jewish contemporaries, though he differed from them in regarding it as having been fulfilled and therefore abrogated. But still, those who (before Christ) were under the Law and had sinned were, in his view, liable to its penalty—death—and could not be excused by God without inconsistency and wavering on His part, unless the Law were first fulfilled and satisfied. The Law was the utterance of God, and could not ever be simply annulled: for that would involve God's repudiation of His own Law. Only when it had been fulfilled could it pass away—and in Christ it had been fulfilled, satisfied: for He had, on the Cross, paid the penalty owed under the Law. So in the strictest sense, Christ " redeemed " men and the price He paid was His death. That this was St. Paul's idea comes out in other passages also, besides those already quoted, in which it is implied or stated that the Law has been satisfied and has therefore no *legal* claim on man for obedience (although the free Christians still voluntarily fulfil its spirit—Rom. viii. 4, referred to above). In that St. Paul has been " crucified with Christ," he died unto the Law (Gal. ii. 19)—*i.e.*, he has, mystically, identified himself with Christ, and so shares His fulfilment of the Law, and is therefore free of it. The same idea underlies Romans vii. 1-6, although it is not worked out very clearly. Still, the main point is clear, " the law hath dominion over a man so long as he liveth . . . ye were made dead to the law through the body of Christ " —through His death they were liberated. So Christians are " not under the law but under grace " (Rom. vi. 14); for " Christ is the end of the law unto justification to every one that believeth " (Rom. x. 4). He was " delivered up for our trespasses " (Rom. iv. 25); He has " abolished in His flesh . . . the law of commandments contained in ordinances " (Eph. ii. 15). All such sayings are most easily explicable on the assumption advanced above that St. Paul regarded the Law as emanating from God and therefore not to be abrogated at will, even by God; but now it has been satisfied by the death of Christ and we are free. It seems a strange idea to us—perhaps St. Paul was aware that it would seem strange to some of his Gentile readers. Possibly that is the explanation of the way in which he speaks at times of the Cross as " foolishness " (1 Cor. i. 18) or claims that his " wisdom " is not " of this world nor of the rulers of this world " (1 Cor. ii. 6).

Be that, however, as it may, the main thought lying behind St. Paul's emphasis on " redemption " and " price " is clear; and it helps to explain other things in his epistles. The modern reader who has not been brought up in an atmosphere where

"justification" is part of the every-day vocabulary is apt to be shocked by the apparent unreality of the legal fiction involved in the "justification" language. Roughly, to us, justification seems to mean neither more nor less than forgiveness. Then why in the world, we ask, does not St. Paul say what he means and speak quite simply (as Christ did) of God forgiving men? For, practically, St. Paul never does so speak. The verb, so frequent in the Gospels, for "forgive" (ἀφιήμι) is only once used by St. Paul of divine forgiveness—and that in a quotation from a psalm (Rom. iv. 7). The noun "forgiveness" is only found once in Ephesians and once in Colossians of the Pauline writings. Our English version sometimes also translates χαρίζομαι as "forgive," but its real meaning is to "act graciously" or "treat graciously." In all the three places where the Revised Version translates it "forgive" in connection with God (Eph. iv. 32; Col. iii. 13, ii. 13), the simple sense of gracious dealing is quite as suitable as forgiveness (a meaning of the verb which Liddell and Scott do not appear to find outside the New Testament): and in the last of the three (Col. ii. 13), "dealt graciously with" is clearly to be preferred to "forgave": God did not "forgive" our trespasses; He "dealt graciously" with our sins by nailing to the Cross the bond that was against us.

Why is it that St. Paul prefers to speak of justification rather than of forgiveness? According to Mr. Thackeray (*The Relation of St. Paul to Contemporary Jewish Thought*, p. 81), the Jew thought of God as continually holding court in heaven and trying men according to the standard of the Law. There is at least one trace of the same idea in St. Paul when he says (Rom. ii. 12) that those who have sinned under (the) Law shall be tried by (the) Law. But in the case of the Christian, on St. Paul's view, thanks to the price paid by Christ to the Law, sentence of satisfaction or acquittal has been already passed: for him, the Law has been satisfied. Therefore "justification" is a more natural word for him to use than "forgiveness." He uses a forensic word precisely because his thought is forensic. It is, moreover, because he so conceives the judgment that St. Paul can as a rule (though not always) speak of justification as already having taken place—"Ye were justified" (1 Cor. vi. 11); "being justified . . . through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus" (Rom. iii. 24; *cf.* v. 1, v. 9). There are frequently phrases which suggest that, in some sense at least, the judgment of the Christian is over and the issue settled. Christians are already sons and heirs (Gal. iv. 7); "there is now no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus" (Rom. viii. 1); they are already sealed (Eph. i. 13, iv. 30); their names are already in the book of life (Philip. iv. 3).

And yet, over against all this, there are constant passages which make it clear that St. Paul believed that a man's ultimate fate still depended on what he did, and was therefore still in the balance. We are all to stand before the judgment-seat (2 Cor. v. 10) and to give account of ourselves (Rom. xiv. 12). God will render to every man according to his works (Rom. ii. 6), and he whose work does not pass the test will only be saved " as through fire " (1 Cor. iii. 15). St. Paul himself had not yet attained (Philip. iii. 12), and it was possible that he might be a castaway (1 Cor. ix. 27). Perhaps it is not possible, nor even desirable, to force these two sets of ideas into logical agreement. But if it is possible it must surely be along the lines suggested above. So far as their lives are concerned ultimate and final judgment for men lies in the future. But their judgment according to the strictness of the Law is over; they are already in the book of life, justified, because Christ has satisfied the claims of the Law. And it is in this context that we can best understand His " making intercession " (Rom. viii. 34). He is by the side of God, a perpetual ransom, as it were, for any offence against the Law.

Further, justification is for those who have faith. It is often supposed that by faith St. Paul meant complete trust in, and trusting oneself to, Christ. Nor will anyone doubt that that was what St. Paul himself did. But Dr. Rashdall has rightly reminded us (*The Idea of Atonement in Christian Theology*, p. 110) that very often St. Paul's words do suggest that for justification the only faith that is necessary is merely intellectual assent. " In his logical moments faith means belief "—*e.g.*, " If thou shalt confess with thy mouth Jesus as Lord, and shalt believe in thy heart that God raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved " (Rom. x. 9). Now if by justification St. Paul meant final salvation, it is difficult to believe that he would have regarded mere intellectual assent as an adequate means. But it is easy to see how intellectual assent is enough if justification only means acquittal from sentence under the Law. If Christ has indeed satisfied its claims upon us, it is surely only natural that the one thing demanded from us, before we receive the benefits of that satisfaction, should be that we accept it and believe, as a mere fact, that the satisfaction has been made.

It is not the aim of this paper to suggest that the above is a complete and exhaustive account of St. Paul's belief concerning the Atonement wrought by Christ. But some such view as has been put forward does at least appear to explain and harmonize many of his sayings which are otherwise difficult to understand, and does surely represent one of the ways in which he tried to intellectualize his religious (and prior) intuition that

the Cross had supreme value for salvation. But it does not account for the sacrificial language he uses (1 Cor. v. 7; Rom. iii. 25, viii. 3; Eph. v. 2). It is just possible that, in view of his conception of the Law, his sacrificial language may represent an early form of the sort of theory which is more fully developed in Hebrews. There is no reason whatever to suppose that St. Paul drew any distinction (as later Christians have tried to do) between the moral and the ceremonial law. To him the Law was one whole and, if the contention of the above pages is correct, had to be fulfilled before it could be abrogated. So far as the moral law went, Christ satisfied it by paying the penalty due for man's sin; may it not be that the sacrificial language is due to a belief that Christ had also fulfilled—and therefore put an end to—the ceremonial law also? This suggestion is only put forward very tentatively as a possible explanation of language which, to the present writer, is full of difficulties. But its acceptance or rejection has no bearing on the main thesis of these pages, which is, in fact, quite independent of it, and only concerned with the language of "redemption" and "justification by faith."

Such an account as has been given above of St. Paul's views will inevitably seem to the modern man unsatisfying, and almost unintelligible—as it clearly was to many early Christians, who could only explain St. Paul's words about ransom and the like by the theory that Christ bought us out of the power of the devil. But before we pass final judgment on St. Paul and his theories, two things need to be remembered. His views given above are only his views of redemption and justification—not of complete salvation. For that, certainly, to St. Paul, did not rely on mere intellectual faith, nor on any external transaction. Full salvation can only come to those who are inwardly saved, who identify themselves with Christ and in the power of that union die to sin. "If any man hath not the spirit of Christ, he is none of his. And if Christ is in you the body is dead because of sin" (Rom. viii. 9, 10; *cf.* Rom. vi. 2, 3, vi. 6; Philip. iii. 10; Gal. ii. 20, v. 24; 2 Cor. iv. 10). His full conception of salvation is as real and spiritual as that of the most modern of us. And, secondly, the truth of St. Paul's intuition of the value of the Cross, to which our conscience also assents, is not invalidated by his failure to rationalize it in a way we can accept. His intuition marks him out as a genius whom we can still strive to follow in religion even if we cannot completely do so in theology.

V. J. K. Brook.

THE RECONCILIATION OF CHRISTENDOM

THERE will be persons, and very likely not a few, who will regard the purpose expressed in the title of this article as an altogether mistaken purpose. They will say that the different parts of the Church do not want to be reconciled; and what is more, that it cannot be done without a breach of conscientious truthfulness, since they differ so much in their beliefs. I will try to overcome these difficulties, for the aim is an important one.

The keynote of the plan which I am about to unfold is this: All religion, at any rate in its Christian form, implies a certain blending of belief with tender affection; but there has always been the danger that the element of belief may overstep its bounds, and contract the sphere which ought to belong to tender affection. This danger has very tragically influenced Christianity in many past ages; to remedy it now requires a difficult effort. The brief sketch of Christian history which I will now give will show what I mean.

In the very first Christian creed which ever was promulgated, the union of belief with tender affection is expressed perfectly. Here is the passage from the Gospel of St. Mark, chapter twelve:

> "And one of the scribes came, and heard them questioning together, and knowing that he had answered them well, asked him, What commandment is the first of all? Jesus answered, The first is, Hear, O Israel; the Lord our God, the Lord is one; and thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength. The second is this, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. There is none other commandment greater than these."

Jesus is there said to have given utterance to two commandments, but the words also constitute a creed, and a creed of that precise character which I have named. The Christian creed, in those words, made its public entrance into the world rightly. Was it ever rightly enlarged? Certainly, if this article is to help to the reconciliation of the Church, its creeds must not here be declared false. I may find fault with them; but the ground on which I shall find fault with them will not here concern the truth of the creeds, but their use; that they have been enforced on men who were not prepared to accept them; that charity has been forgotten by the rulers of the Church. This, if Christianity is regarded as a practical matter (and what is Christianity if not practical?), is the kind of error which the history of it suggests, as will be made plain by a crucial instance. The Church of Rome is to-day the most powerful of the Christian Churches, and in many ways deservedly so. She may be slow

to admit a desire to be reconciled to the other Churches rather than to *convert* them; but I cannot conceive that the Church of Rome to-day would affirm that she has always treated the other Christian Churches with tender affection. Something there has been wrong in the Christianity of the past which has to be retrieved to-day.

If then I commend, as I shall do, the primitive and the mediæval Church, it is with the remembrance that there is something wrong in it. I do not commend it as a perfect model, clear in its guidance for every part of mortal life, but rather as a guide sharing in the imperfection of those whom she teaches; and if the religion so presented is animated by one pure purpose among many false and mistaken purposes, it may be possible to say in the end that this was a religion worthy of being followed.

To reverence, yet to forgive those whom we reverence, is no impossible combination; we have to remember, each of us, our own individual faultiness; and among those who need our forgiveness, there may be some who are greater than ourselves. And others, who are not greater than ourselves, may yet not be altogether bad persons, though offenders. The world is in a sad state, as indeed is implied in these well-known words of Jesus himself: "If any one will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross daily, and follow me." For these words imply, what is true, that we live in a world in which suffering is a constant phenomenon; and not suffering only, but suffering through the ill-doing of others; and those others, in spite of their ill-doing, may not have been altogether bad people. This suffering is the lot which Jesus bids us cheerfully accept; and it is very evident that He connects the cheerful acceptance of it with the future life, to which He bids us all look forward. In that future life He is to be the ruler; and certainly here is a belief which He bids us embrace; does He enforce it with threats? Not as I understand His words. So far as He threatened at all, His threats were against those who showed coldness of heart and sloth in doing good; these, and not those who rejected Himself, were the agents of the evil spirit.

But what Jesus never did for Himself—that is, threaten those who rejected Him—that the Apostle Paul, in one passage, and in one alone, did for Him. It is a passage close to the beginning of the second epistle to the Thessalonians; here are the important verses:

"Seeing it is a righteous thing with God to recompense tribulation to them that trouble you; and to you who are troubled rest with us, when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, in flaming fire taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey

not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ; who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power; when he shall come to be glorified in his saints, and to be admired in all them that believe (because our testimony among you was believed) in that day."

This passage will be quite enough to show that the early Christians lay under great temptation to revenge themselves on their persecutors; I could quote many others; but none from so illustrious a writer, and a writer so generally penetrated with feelings of love and mercy. Let me take a step forward in history. When Christianity became supreme in the Roman Empire, the temptation on Christians to revenge themselves took a sharper form; they began to persecute their former persecutors, and argued that to persecute heathens and heretics was a duty, because persecution might convert them, and then they would be saved from that much severer persecution to which God would subject them when He cast them into hell after death, which persecution would be for all eternity. This was the argument which Augustine, the famous bishop of Hippo in Africa, put forward in his 93rd epistle, where it may still be read. Out of this sort of view grew persecutions by the rulers of the Church, terrible and increasing during many centuries. Is it a pleasure to me to refer to them, in an article which maintains that Christianity is the saving element among mankind to-day? It is no pleasure; but Christianity saves because it leads men to confess their sins; and the sins of the saints are not less sins than the sins of the sinners.

Let me revert to the more pleasing part of my subject. In Jesus the reconciliation of the Churches must lie; and Jesus did not desire that any man should persecute on his behalf. The doctrine of immortality, as Jesus uttered it, was a pure doctrine; and among those who embraced it from his lips, and followed it after him, many followed with a pure heart. On this earth, so tormented and full of disorders as we see it to-day, there is yet the seed of eternal life. How shall we trace, through the centuries, its slow and gradual growth?

They who felt themselves one with God, and one with Jesus, began it; as, for instance, the Apostle Paul, from whom I have felt bound to quote one passage with some regret, but now let me quote another with pure pleasure, as breathing the very spirit of love:

"I am persuaded, that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor things present, nor things to come, nor powers, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord" (Rom. viii. 38, 39).

And take this other passage from that other enthusiastic Apostle, Peter:

"For hereunto were ye called: because Christ also suffered for you, leaving you an example that ye should follow his steps: who did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth: who, when he was reviled, reviled not again; when he suffered, threatened not; but committed himself to him that judgeth righteously: who his own self bare our sins in his body upon the tree, that we, having died unto sins, might live unto righteousness; by whose stripes ye were healed" (1 Peter ii. 21-24).

Such examples of pure love towards Jesus, and spiritual union with Him, without any thought of the power that He might have to retaliate upon their persecutors after death, are rare in the Fathers of the Church, and even if found, are hardly ever expressed so pathetically and naturally as in these two last quotations; but I can give one instance in which even this natural pathos was attained. One of the Christian martyrs at Carthage, a woman, Felicitas, was condemned to be torn and devoured by wild beasts, and was sent to a dungeon. There the pains of childbirth overtook her, and she suffered much.

"The jailer said to her, If thy present sufferings are so great, what wilt thou do when thou art thrown to the wild beasts? This thou didst not consider when thou refusedst to sacrifice. She answered, I now suffer *myself* all that I suffer; but then there will be *another* who shall suffer for me, because I also will suffer for him."—Neander's *Church History* (Torrey's translation), vol. i., p. 170.

The genius of Christianity could not be more perfectly expressed than in these words.

The love which is at the heart of the Kingdom of God, whether it is expressed in word or in act, is generally a seed growing secretly; seldom can we see it in its true and proper form. May I say that the kiss which the martyrs gave each other after much suffering, immediately before the stroke which delivered them to death, was an instance of divine love made visible? And was not the divine love visible in the monk Telemachus, who ventured into the arena to stop the bloody combats of gladiators and was slain; and who by his death so moved the emperor Honorius that an imperial edict stopped these inhuman spectacles for ever? The name of Telemachus is not illustrious, any more than is that of Felicitas or her fellow-martyr Perpetua; but the love of God seldom has its greatest exponents in illustrious names. Seldom; I must not say never. The names of Peter and Paul were not illustrious in their own day, but they are illustrious now; and the name of Benedict, the founder of the Benedictine order of monks, is illustrious now, and he was an example of the pure love of God, and of the pure love of men

too, as themselves also sharers in the future kingdom of God, if only they search after God's will, the highest and the holiest, with all their hearts. Nor did he use threats, beyond what was needful for the discipline of the conduct of imperfect beings. Very full of pure conscience was he; so full, that in an article which must have moderate limits, I must content myself with his name alone as a type of the Christian virtue of those who came after him—the virtue of a rational hopefulness, and of love unmixed with hatred. Here is Benedict's account of his object and of his hope; I will quote it as given in Montalembert's *Monks of the West*, vol. ii., pp. 44-5:

"We must, then, form a school of divine servitude, in which, we trust, nothing too heavy or too rigorous will be established. But if, in conformity with right and justice, we should exercise a little severity for the amendment of vices or the preservation of charity, beware of fleeing under the impulse of terror from the way of salvation, which cannot but have a hard beginning. When a man has walked for some time in obedience and faith his heart will expand, and he will run with the unspeakable sweetness of love in the way of God's commandments. May he grant that, never straying from the instruction of the Master, and persevering in his doctrine in the monastery until death, we may share by patience in the sufferings of Christ, and be worthy to share his kingdom."

Coming more into the details of Benedict's idea, I may add this: It was his design that his monastery should be self-supporting; and not merely self-supporting, but that the products of monastic labour should overflow into the world outside the monastery, and be a benefit to all. He forbade his monks to win money for themselves; he commanded them to be hospitable, to relieve the poor, to entertain strangers. He commanded them to work with their hands, and also to read; and these two commands involved the command to write; and the writing of manuscripts became a part of the work of every Benedictine monastery. Thus, in the first instance, manuscripts of Scripture and of the Fathers were multiplied; but afterwards (through the influence of Cassiodorus) manuscripts of Greek and Roman writers also; and it is largely by this means that the manuscripts of classical writers have been preserved to us at the present day. The adornment and illustration of these manuscripts often showed extreme beauty; and this was one (though by no means the only) way by which art survived the great breach which it underwent in the transition from ancient to modern times.

Benedict, then, whose Order of monks began in the south of Italy, in the first quarter of the sixth century after Christ, was not only a true saint, but was also a saint who sowed the seed of manifold good for the world in the centuries to come. There

were not many who were his equals; but in any case I am keeping in mind this unchanging characteristic of Christian history, that "the kingdom of God cometh not with observation"; the true progressive element works for the most part invisibly, and is hardly seen till it has done its work. There were many violent persons in the world between the days of Benedict and the year 1500 A.D., which was nearly a thousand years after him; and some of these violent persons were violent on behalf of Christianity, and others against Christianity; some of them were generous and brave; but if we ask for the signs of human progress, it is not to them that we shall look. I have fixed on the year 1500 A.D. as a convenient halting-place, where we may stop in the course of history and survey what had been happening, because it is before the Reformation and mediæval religion was still dominant, and must be credited with what had taken place. What progress had then been made?

The answer is striking and most instructive. Generally speaking, immense progress had been made in the Christian world, and by comparison but little in the world beyond Christendom; but the points in which no progress at all had been made in the Christian world were such as reveal an imperfect conception of what Christianity, in its true spirit, is. For judicial torture the Church is not directly responsible, but it was a great evil, especially when used in order to extract evidence from witnesses, and it is hard to think that the Church could not have brought it to a close if that had been desired. But the authorities of the Church themselves used great cruelty in support of their own intolerance, which had nowise diminished in the course of the centuries. Then lastly, that terrible disease, the plague, was still most fatal; and if we ask why, the answer must be that in the teaching of the Christian religion this error had crept in, the belief that want of cleanliness in the person was a legitimate form of self-denial.

But in almost all other points we shall have cause to wonder at the advance made in Christian countries by the year 1500 A.D. In science, the mariner's compass had been discovered as a principle, and invented as an instrument; clocks with a pendulum had been invented; astronomical observations had been made, far more accurate than those of the ancients; cheap paper had been made; printing had been invented. Many more discoveries in mechanical power, and in art too, might be mentioned; and the instantaneous use of such discoveries was not less remarkable than the discoveries themselves; Christians were alive to the tips of their fingers. So, too, when we read of charters being granted to towns and cities, we at once feel that freedom was in the air in a way in which it never was so

in Mohammedan countries; and what a spirit of adventure and strength is implied in the crossing of the Atlantic Ocean! Nor must we forget the great and never-failing courage of the missionaries of those days, who often were martyred for their faith.

With my whole heart do I celebrate the virtues of mediæval Christianity; but can I forget its faults? There were wounds made at that time on the whole Christian society, often by saintly and noble persons, of which the sad results remain to us; which if we can remedy, then may the whole Church be restored to its state of pristine beneficence.

I am appealing, in this article, to all those who believe that Jesus Christ lifted mankind into a higher world than this visible world, a world in which immortal life is one of the essential characteristics. I am not entering upon any intellectual argument; I am merely asking that all those whom I have just described shall recognize in all possible ways that they are friends to each other. And in order that that source of quarrelling which lies in differences of belief (a very fertile source) may be removed, I would have them establish between themselves a certain area, a Garden of Eden of the Spirit, where they may forget their differences, and remember only their agreements. Then the Church, though still divided, will be delivered from that seed of bitterness which the strife for victory engenders; then the different parts of the Church will be able to act cordially as one; and this cordial brotherhood will overflow into quarters where it is now unknown, into the relations between Soviet and Western European, Christian and Mohammedan, Englishman and Hindu. I am pleading for the cessation of theological argument, but not for the cessation of true religious feeling, and for the increase of all actions that have the power of uniting men in sympathy. Then, lastly, the true creed will reveal its victorious power, in points where it is now disputed. Beyond this perhaps I ought not to go in the present article.

JOHN RICKARDS MOZLEY.

SOME PICTURES OF SAINT FRANCIS*

WITHIN fifty years of the death of St. Francis, one of the most remarkable saints in Christendom, was born an artist who was destined to paint the story of the Saint's life, and to be one of the most exceptionally gifted painters who have ever lived; this was Giotto.

* Being the substance of a public lecture delivered at Armstrong College, Newcastle-on Tyne, on October 6, 1926.

To appreciate the originality and courage of St. Francis it is necessary to realize the circumstances of the Church at the end of the twelfth century; likewise, I think nothing will show the originality and courage of Giotto more clearly than a consideration of the kind of picture which was being painted in the thirteenth.

When St. Francis died in 1226, there was no painter in Italy sufficiently master of his medium to be able to give any adequate rendering of the Saint and what he stood for. In the Church of St. Francis at Pescia, a small town between Pistoia and Lucca, there is a painting dated 1235, and signed by Bonaventura Berlinghieri, in which we see a full-length figure of the Saint, surrounded by eight incidents from his life.

No doubt Berlinghieri would have wished to endow his picture with the strongest resemblance to the Saint himself (whom he may have known by sight, or at least have had described to him by close followers of Francis), and would also have wished to suggest in the pose and expression of the figure all the qualities of the individual, of the quite exceptional man whose life and whose preaching of the ideals of poverty and humility were such that he stirred the whole of Italy and many other countries as well during his lifetime—in 1224 Agnellus of Pisa is said to have landed in England with five friars and five laymen.

But Berlinghieri was not able to use any of the means whereby we are accustomed to see human emotions expressed in a picture nowadays: his important duty was to represent St. Francis in the way in which it was customary to paint the picture of a saint at that time, and to give to the people who could not read something to look at which would tell them the story of the Saint, and I think that with the meagre power of making anything look real which the painter had at his disposal, he has succeeded in making his illustrations of incidents in the life of the Saint perfectly comprehensible. What the figure has of nobility it owes to the tradition in which it is painted—the tradition which produced the magnificent mosaics in Ravenna in the sixth century, and which set the type which was still being imitated by painters all over Italy in the thirteenth, the tradition which was so strong that it blinded them to the real aspect of nature and prevented them from making any serious attempt to set down the things in the world as they actually appeared before them.

So this Byzantinism meant that artists copied the shapes painted by their forerunners, and, if we see nobility in these formal conceptions, it is not so much because they were done by one man whose intellect transcended that of any of his fellows, but because the reality of their faith in those early days

intoxicated the minds of the workers in mosaic or paint with devotion to the types which had been chosen to represent holy personages, the result being that what they wanted to do was to create another image more striking than the one before, but made according to the same formula. The time had not yet come for the individual's own conception of how a saint should be represented to be a matter of supreme importance.

In the Accademia in Florence there is a painting which is now attributed to another member of the Berlinghieri family, of St. Francis receiving the Stigmata. It is interesting to compare the formality of this representation with the carefully designed seraph "having six wings, flaming and resplendent," and "betwixt the wings the figure of a Man crucified, having His hands and feet stretched forth in the shape of a cross, and fastened unto a Cross," with later paintings of this, I suppose, the most significant episode in the life of the Saint.

The incident occurred on the mountain of La Verna, whither Francis had retired rather than attend the Chapter-General of the Order in 1224, for by this time, although the Saint was only forty-two, there had already been much dissension among the brethren, and it grieved him to know that many of them had desired to have his original rule made less strenuous, and that this modification had been ratified by the Pope, Honorius III., in the previous year. Afterwards Francis, blind and ill, had retired from active conduct of the Order with a few companions to practise solitary prayer. We must keep in mind this distinction between the actual life and teaching of the Saint himself and what his followers made of it when we consider how well or ill he has been represented in pictures.

There is another altar-piece of the Saint in the Byzantine style which is said to have been painted by Giunta Pisano, who died about 1260 and was working in Assisi in 1236. It is in the Church of St. Francis at Assisi to-day. This is a better attempt at a portrait than Berlinghieri's, and I think it is probably very much more like a human face than any other painted by Pisano, the reason for this being that he was asked to do it by those who were the Saint's friends, and who would have demanded the best likeness that the painter could give them, whereas, when he painted the Madonna or Christ, he would not have had this incentive to depart from the traditional manner of representing faces.

During the thirteenth century very little real progress was made in painting. Some fine mosaics were finished in Santa Maria in Trastevere in Rome in 1289, and an elaborate series of frescoes was done in the Upper Church of St. Francis at Assisi, probably between 1250 and 1290; but the artists who were

responsible for these, although they show a greater freedom from tradition than Giunta Pisano and had a fine sense of design, still were hampered by the stiffness and lifelessness of Byzantinism. It is this lifelessness which I would specially wish to emphasize in contrast with the life with which the works of Giotto are overflowing.

An important point to remember is that by 1266, just about the time of Giotto's birth, were completed the sculptured reliefs on the pulpit in Siena Cathedral which were made by Niccolo Pisano. This sculptor had emancipated himself from the stereotyped forms, first by imitating classical models, and then in imitation not only of the forms of classical sculpture but of the spirit which inspired it, by going to nature herself for inspiration. No doubt he was influenced by the excellent sculpture which had been done in France during the later years of the twelfth and the first half of the thirteenth century, but he was the first Italian to make so great an advance, and his son Giovanni carried the study of nature further than his father. Giovanni was about fifteen years old when Giotto was born, and no doubt Giotto was struck by the likeness to nature of Giovanni's sculptures—so much greater than anything of this kind which had been achieved by contemporary painters.

It is not possible to speak of Giotto without mentioning Mr. Berenson, who, in his book on Florentine painters, has so clearly shown how this painter was the first to make things look as though you could touch them. Earlier artists had failed altogether to suggest modelling satisfactorily, and it is in the statement of the third dimension on a flat surface, the rendering of the thickness and substance of things, in which Giotto excelled. It is not surprising that the sculptors who have three dimensions to work in should have been the forerunners of painters in the discovery of natural shapes. The allegorical figures which Giotto painted in monochrome in the Arena Chapel at Padua show in the most convincing manner the ability of the artist to represent the third dimension. The folds in the drapery are real folds showing how it falls, and expressive of the form beneath, totally unlike the stereotyped pattern of lines on Byzantine drapery. The figures owe none of their beauty to colour as they are painted in monochrome, and so we can form a very just estimate of their appearance from photographs.

His contemporaries realized his excellence, and Giotto was called to Rome before the close of the thirteenth century to undertake most important commissions in St. Peter's. In Rome he associated with Dante, who was to be his lifelong friend. It was after his stay there that he went to Assisi to decorate the Church of St. Francis.

There has been much difference of opinion as to precisely how much Giotto himself painted, and how much is the work of his followers (guided or not by the master's designs) in this church—or rather two churches—for the Church of St. Francis is built in two separate stories. I think that realization of our ignorance always constitutes a definite increase in our knowledge, and the more uncertainty there is about attributions, the more closely the pictures will be studied; but I do not think we take a grave risk in assuming that the first nineteen pictures in the upper church may be referred to Giotto himself or to his direct inspiration.

This series of twenty-eight scenes from the life of the Saint was done, as all such pictures were in these times, with the definite object of making the story clear for those who could not read. Giotto has succeeded in performing this task admirably. For example, before the picture of St. Francis resigning his inheritance, there is no need to ask who are the chief protagonists, the scene is excellently realized. "But what strange, cubist-looking faces!" you may say.

We must remember that in the case of nearly all Giotto's existing work, especially in this series, what we are looking at is very largely the handiwork of restorers. Although Giotto found difficulty in drawing faces, he could certainly do better than this; but I think that the action of the figures completely explains what they are feeling without the necessity for facial expressions to make it more plain—we see, for example, how the enraged father has to be held back from assaulting his son.

The architecture is obviously "out," so far as the laws of perspective are concerned (these were not to be formulated for another century), yet we can see exactly what the buildings were like which Giotto wished to represent. Despite the fact that he was unable to draw a knee or an elbow with anything approaching the accuracy we should expect from the most inexperienced student to-day, he was able to create a picture as impressive and convincing as this still is, in spite of the brutal treatment it has received since it was first painted.

That Giotto was courageous in undertaking to paint subjects and attitudes which had been attempted with only the smallest measure of success, if at all, by his predecessors is plain from his picture of the "Dream of Innocent III." St. Francis and his original twelve followers went to Rome in 1210 to ask for the Pope's approval of the rule which they had adopted. Innocent was at first not unnaturally backward in giving his assent to the preaching of such an extreme doctrine as that of Francis, foreseeing complications, but he dreamt that his church of the Lateran was falling, and that Francis supported it and

preserved it from destruction. After this dream he was ready to give the order his verbal approval.

What is, I think, specially remarkable in this picture is that St. Francis really does look as if he were able to support the Lateran. Giotto has drawn him in the attitude of a man who has a very heavy weight to cope with. He has not been quite so successful with the recumbent figure of the Pope, but the two watchers, the one on the right dropping off to sleep, show the most astonishing power of realism compared with any painting whatsoever by his predecessors.

The picture of the brethren seeing St. Francis appear in a fiery chariot, when he was absent from them praying in a hut in the Canon's garden, may be said to suffer from Giotto's genius for making things look solid, because of the vision itself, which is described by St. Bonaventura as " a chariot of fire of marvellous brightness, . . . which turned thrice hither and thither . . . and over the chariot a shining ball of fire rested, in appearance like unto the sun, making the night radiant." This vision, then, is represented in exactly the same scale of reality as the excellently conceived figures of the surprised brethren, one of whom is calling to his fellows to come out and see what is happening. The chariot is even supported on the roof.

It is dangerous to contrast Giotto's sudden ability to represent almost any attitude convincingly after the Byzantine rigidity with the sparing way in which novelties of gesture were introduced into the set types which were prevalent in Greek art up to the fifth century before Christ, and its slow emancipation (an emancipation which was greatly helped by the difficulty of fitting figures into awkward spaces) from set types, to the disadvantage of early Greek sculpture; dangerous because it was largely through the influence of the achievements of Classical art and the memory of the spirit of Classical times that the Renaissance developed in Italy; but it is very remarkable to find so difficult an attitude as that of the figure stooping to drink in the picture of the miracle of the spring so convincingly rendered, and I believe that the sudden and amazing advance which painting had made was due almost entirely to the astonishing personal genius of Giotto—to the individual's independence of outlook which prompted him to take nature as his model.

By 1306 Giotto had probably gone to Padua, where he painted the life of Christ and of the Blessed Virgin in the Arena Chapel (his best preserved works), and also the allegorical figures. Later he returned to Florence, and some time after 1317 he painted a series of scenes in the life of St. Francis in the Bardi Chapel in the Church of Santa Croce.

These and other frescoes which he did there were actually white-washed over, probably in the seventeenth century, and, after they were recovered last century, they were almost completely repainted. Of these the "Obsequies" is especially famous.

It is difficult to realize that there are twenty-two figures in this scene, so spacious does it seem. The plainness of the background here and in the picture of the Saint before the Soldan shows that the painter had now realized that he could treat his settings more effectively than he did in the Upper Church of Assisi, where the architecture is in some cases so insistent that it interferes with the prominence of the figures.

In his Santa Croce rendering of the reception of the Stigmata, it is quite amazing that the figure of the Saint should appear so impressive, despite the queer splayed-out attitude of his legs. The lines joining the Seraphic Vision of the Crucified to the Saint make one realize forcibly how essential it was that these paintings should be easily understood by the beholders, and how Giotto must have considered this necessity more urgently than he did the perfection of his designs, for which he is so greatly praised in modern times, because I can conceive nothing more upsetting to the balance of so simple and satisfactory a composition than these five straight red lines drawn across it in such an arbitrary way. I am sure that Giotto's instinct for composing a picture was so natural and spontaneous that he would be quite amazed if he were to know how emphatically this quality has been accounted to him as a remarkable gift, and I cannot help thinking that, if he were to be shown quite a meanly-designed figure-painting of our own times, he would be so much impressed by a verisimilitude which he could never have attained himself that he would feel himself to be a very poor performer in comparison with the modern artist.

This great painter, with an ability to make the people in his pictures live as they never had before, has succeeded in illustrating the Franciscan story in a convincing manner, with dignity and a fine sense of drama. But it was not given to Giotto to suggest adequately the Saint's contact with the heavenly mysteries, except by such obvious expedients as the red bars in the picture of the reception of the Stigmata in Santa Croce, and it was as a visionary as the Blessed Poor One, who was privileged to see divine mysteries, that St. Francis must have made a strong appeal to the imagination of the Italian people.

We are greatly indebted to Mr. Berenson, who has published and appreciated a series of paintings by the Sienese painter Sassetta, representing incidents in the life of the Saint, and which were done between 1437 and 1444.

In Florence at this time the generation of Masaccio and Uccello had arisen who were finding out how to represent the appearance of nature in a more convincing way than any ever dreamed of by Giotto. Perspective and anatomy were being ardently studied, but in Siena the old gift for beauty of pure line rather than an interest in modelling the roundness of forms had not given way to a desire to emulate the sheer naturalism of Florence.

In Sassetta's picture of the marriage of St. Francis to poverty are three lovely maidens, Chastity, Poverty, and Obedience, who, having encountered the Saint, mysteriously vanished, and we see them passing through the air in the most graceful and convincing manner; this beatific vision forms a strong contrast to Giotto's earthbound fiery chariot at Assisi.

In Sassetta's picture of St. Francis renouncing his inheritance the Saint has the meagre frame one would expect after the privations we are told he had endured in an attempt to escape from his father, and later when he was imprisoned by him, whereas Giotto's St. Francis is, as Mr. Berenson says, "the powerfully built, firm-fleshed nude that Classical European art has ever sought after as the surest means of conveying a convincing sense of solid form."

Sassetta lived at a time when perspective was understood in a way Giotto had never imagined, and by his day it was usual to see many different kinds of folk in pictures, readily recognizable as fat or thin, spiritual or gross, the first impetus which led to the possibility of such various treatment having most certainly been given by the discoveries of Giotto. Thus it was easy for Sassetta's personal gift for lyrical painting to find a fuller expression than it could have in earlier times.

In his version of St. Francis before the Soldan, Sassetta has represented the Saint plunging into the flames, making a picture of a miracle rather than of the more probable scene chosen by Giotto where, Francis having offered to undergo the ordeal, the Soldan asked his priests to do the same, and they are seen retiring in dismay. Giotto treated this with a reality and power which show him to have been the greater painter of the two, however much the imaginative treatment of Sassetta may have enabled him to give us an aspect of St. Francis which Giotto missed, and which must have specially appealed to the love of Sassetta's contemporaries for mysterious and beautiful pictures.

The sixteenth century brought with it a new realism, different from that of Giotto, different from the discoveries of the scientific Florentines of the fifteenth, different from Leonardo's skill in giving his creations subtlety and sweetness by the play of light on a countenance emerging from the shadows, Leonardo, who,

with his immense manual dexterity and amazing intellect, evolved with an infinitude of pains, with the closest and most searching drawing, a conception of Holy Personages which has, I think, never been equalled at all for its sheer, unworldly beauty.

But the realism of which I am now writing is not an affair of unworldliness, but a realism of flesh and blood—not the striving of a Giotto to express what he wishes to say with an instrument which is not yet adequate, but the use of the now completely expressive instrument ready to respond to the slightest variation in touch or treatment, the technique which has been the heritage of all painters who were brought up in Italy in the sixteenth century.

There is a story told of Tintoretto, who found it a very difficult matter to get any work to do in Venice in his young days; he painted two pictures of heads seen in very strong light and shade, and showed them in the principal street, the Merceria; this brought him reputation. Such painting was a new thing in those days, and, whether the story be true or not, Tintoretto, though always a great colourist, was to use this method of strong light and shade to paint many figures full of the most intense life and dramatic movement.

To Venice in 1570 came a Cretan youth of twenty-five called Domenico Theotocopulos to join some of his countrymen who had settled there. In his native island he had been brought up in the old Byzantine tradition which had lingered there, and, I am told, still lingers to-day. Remember the fervour which created the image in the time when Byzantine art was at its best. The painter Theotocopulos was filled with this idea of striving after the expression of the inexpressible, and now he saw the work of Tintoretto, master of the most complete technical accomplishment—a penetrating protraitist, painter of figures in a thousand impossibly difficult attitudes. From this example the Cretan learnt how to create a living personality invested with the significance he was able to imagine in him.

After five years in Venice this Cretan went to Spain, there and thereafter to be known as " El Greco "—the Greek.

And now I wish to write of the conception we may have formed of St. Francis as a *man*—the time has come in the development of painting when we may expect not only to see the incidents in his life illustrated for us with all their accessories, not merely to see the pleasantly dematerialized idylls of such as Sassetta, who so elegantly painted one charming aspect of the story in a manner which must have delighted the luxurious Sienese, but to see the face of the man himself.

In the sixteenth century in Spain there was found a passionate Catholicism and devotion to the sterner aspects of religion, and there the Franciscans had an enormous following. For this people Greco painted his St. Francis—the Francis of flesh and blood.

There is a painting by this master in the National Gallery of Ireland of the reception of the Stigmata. It is the moment of ecstasy when the Seraphic Vision appears to the Saint; but the Seraph is barely indicated in the corner of the picture. It is to the man himself we look for a realization of what the painting means, not to an elaborate presentation of an angelic vision such as earlier painters carefully devised.

I think that in this face we can see the man who "would seek lonely places, dear unto mourners, and there devote himself without ceasing unto groanings which cannot be uttered, and, after long importunity in prayer, won an answer from the Lord," who "taught his friars to make their huts poor, their cabins of wood, not of stone," and to look for "edification, not for ornament" in books, and who carried a broom with him to sweep out any unclean church he might see. The man who enforced upon himself the penance of eating his food from the same dish as a loathsome leper for some sin he imagined he had committed, and who insisted that he should be led naked through Assisi with a rope round his neck as a penance for having given way to the temptation of swallowing a little hot broth when he was ill.

A madman, of course, but a madman who was not afraid to tell the Knights of Perugia who resented his preaching in their city that their hearts were lifted up in pride, a madman who had the courage of his convictions to a degree which has, I suppose, never been equalled. He is not forgotten.

I think that if there were a painter predestined to be the ideal interpreter of St. Francis, Greco might be said to have been such a man.

E. M. O'R. Dickey.

THE CASE FOR A ONE YEAR MINISTRY

Prof. Turner's famous article on "New Testament Chronology" in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible* makes out a case for the traditional date of the Crucifixion, A.D. 29, which few scholars are inclined to dispute. We may therefore take this as firm ground from which to start our discussion. Our purpose is to state the case for a one year Ministry of Our Lord. The writer inclines ever so slightly to the view here proposed, but

is conscious that he could argue for a Ministry of two or three years without violence to his convictions. Perhaps we may say that the one year theory, common in the early Church and generally held to-day by German scholars and those who have felt their influence, is not accepted by many Anglicans. The two years' theory, to which Prof. Turner inclines, is more popular but has not succeeded in ousting the widely held three years' theory.*

We now take the Gospels separately and examine their Witness.

I. *Mark.*—Recent criticism agrees with Papias that St Mark arranged his reminiscences "not however in order."† We are not justified in adhering rigidly to Mk's chronological order. But, broadly speaking, the sequence of events seems to be historical. *Prima facie*, as Mk. mentions one passover only, he imagines a one year Ministry. These are the relevant facts; of the double set of suggested dates in brackets the former supposes a two years', the latter a one year, Ministry.

1. The Baptist begins to preach (autumn of 26/27), i. 4.

2. After a while Jesus comes to him (Feb. 27/28), i. 9.

3. An interval follows, spent in Judæa (March-April 27/28), i. 12, 13.

4. John having been arrested—the events are described retrospectively in vi. 17—Jesus goes to Galilee and begins His Ministry (after Passover of 27/28), i. 14.

5. Jesus and His disciples pass through the ripe cornfields. This may be any time between the middle of April and the middle of June (27/28), according to the height (or otherwise) above sea level, ii. 23.

6. The 5000 sit down on the green grass, vi. 39. This is generally taken to imply the spring, not earlier than six weeks before the Passover (28/29). Only for a short time in Palestine is there any green grass. It is possible, however, that the verdure was due to the presence of a perennial fountain; the need of water for the multitude would be as pressing as the need of food.‡

7. Chapters vii and viii present difficulties. In vii. 24 Jesus goes N.W. to a spot outside Herod's sway, "the borders of Tyre and Sidon." This need not mean more than one day's journey from the Lake.§ In vii. 31 the best text says He left the borders of Tyre and came to the Lake *via* Sidon and

* Streeter, *The Four Gospels*, 421 ff., says that Jn.'s chronology solves difficulties and is the only one we have.

† Dr. Goudge points out to me that οὐ μέντοι τάξει may mean "not in catechetical order," like Matt.

‡ The traditional site is Seven Springs, where there was abundance of water, and therefore grass, all the year round. See B. Meistermann, *New Guide to the Holy Land*, p. 546.

§ So Dalman, *Orte und Wege Jesu*, p. 173. See G. A. Smith's Atlas, plate 44.

Decapolis. A variant reading, "the borders of Tyre and Sidon," hints that early scribes were puzzled. In viii. 1-8 we have the Feeding of the 4000, which is taken by a conservative scholar like Dr. Headlam* to be a doublet of the 5000 story. In viii. 10 Dalmanutha and its variants show that tradition was uncertain as to this part of Our Lord's itinerary. At viii. 27 Jesus starts northwards once more, leaving Herod's territory again. Some scholars think that vii. 24-viii. 26 is a narrative, originally independent, used by Mk., which described the one journey which Jesus took northward of Galilee. Lk. omits the section entirely and may have taken the same view. If we accept Mk's. chronological order and take vi. 39 to imply the early spring, then a whole year is needed for the events of vii and viii, and Mk. has a two years' Ministry. If vii. 24-viii. 26 is disregarded, five or six weeks are enough for the visit to Cæsarea Philippi in viii. 27, the return to Capernaum, ix. 33, and the last journey to Jerusalem. There are indications in the last chapters that Jesus had friends in Jerusalem, presumably made on former visits. Perhaps Peter did not go with Jesus to the earlier feasts and therefore they are not mentioned in Mk.

The result of the above discussion is that Mk., as we have it, supposes a two years' Ministry. But if the Evangelist wrote "not in order," we must not lay too much stress on his chronological data. Further, the events which are relied upon to occupy the second year are thought by some scholars to be an alternative version of what took place in the earlier period. Dr. Headlam grants this for viii. 1-26. If the doubt which attaches to these verses is allowed to be extended to vii. 24-37, then the evidence for a second year disappears and the conclusion sometimes drawn from the mention of but one passover is valid.

II. *Matthew.*—This Gospel contributes nothing to our inquiry. From xi. 21 (=Lk. x. 13) with its reference to Chorazin and Bethsaida we may deduce a more extended Galilæan ministry than that described in Mk.

III. *Luke.*—1. In iii. 1 we have an elaborate dating of the Baptist's ministry, which began in the 15th year of Tiberius, when Pontius Pilate, Herod, Philip, Lysanias, Annas and Caiaphas held their respective offices. The 15th year of Tiberius is most naturally dated from the death of Augustus in August of A.D. 14 and will then run from August 28 to August 29, a view which lands us in difficulties. But we may

* *Life and Teaching of Jesus Christ*, p. 280. If such symbolical interpretations are legitimate, we may suppose that the 4000, in the Gentile region of Decapolis, represent the Gentiles, the 5000 the Jews. Cf. the 12 baskets full (12 apostles) and 7 baskets (7 "deacons" of Acts vi. 3).

suppose that St Luke computed his years according to the Eastern reckoning, which began in Seleucid times and was abolished, probably by Trajan, and thought of October 1 as the New Year.* The 15th year of Tiberius will then be October 1, 27 to September 30, 28, and John's ministry will have begun in the autumn of 27.

Lysanias, tetrarch of Abilene, has been dismissed as a gross blunder, the historical Lysanias, King in Cœle-Syria, having been executed in B.C. 36. But there is good evidence for a younger Lysanias, and Lk.'s accuracy need not be impugned.†

2. Lk. may well intend us to think that the Baptism of Jesus followed 6 months after iii. 1, since Jesus was 6 months younger than John. After the Temptation the Ministry begins at Nazareth, where Jesus proclaims "the acceptable year of the Lord," iv. 19. Clement and Origen, followed on this point by many modern scholars, interpreted this to mean that the Ministry lasted one calendar year.

3. The Transfiguration is described in ix. 28-36 and in 51 the last journey to Jerusalem begins. From here to the end a few weeks or at most months are supposed. It is natural to suppose that chapters v-ix comprise a short period of time in Lk's. reckoning.

If 29 was the Crucifixion year, and if iii. 1 points to 27 as the beginning of John's ministry, then everything in Lk. agrees with the theory of a one year Ministry; if so, then St Luke will have taken Mk. to mean this.

IV. *John.*—The evidence is rather complicated and can be interpreted in more than one way.

1. In ii. 13 Jesus goes to Jerusalem for the Passover. The Cleansing of the Temple is attached to this visit, which is dated by ii. 20, "46 years has this temple been building." The building began apparently in the 18th year (dating from B.C. 37) of Herod, i.e. B.C. 20 or 19. Adding 45 complete years we reach A.D. 26 or 27; 46 may mean 45 years and some months, or 46 complete years. That is, the spring of 28 is the latest possible date.‡

2. The Baptist has not yet been arrested in iv. 1, but iii. 30 hints at the arrest. The journey to Galilee in iv. 3 seems to correspond to that of Mk. i. 14.

3. The words of iv. 35 ("yet 4 months and then cometh the

* Cichorius in I. *N.T.W.* (1923) pp. 16 ff. works out this thesis. Meyer, *Ursprung und Anfänge*, iii. 205 ff., says it is quite possible. He will not allow that the earlier theories (reckoning from the grant of the tribunician power for life, or from the supposed time when power in the provinces equal to that of Augustus was bestowed) are possible. All coins and all writers date from the death of Augustus.

† See Plummer's Commentary, and Cronin, *J.T.S.* (1917), xviii. 147 ff.

‡ Turner works out 27 as the result. But his figures seem to make 28 possible. Note that (B.C.) 19 + 46 = (A.D.) 28. There is no year 0.

harvest . . . the fields are white unto the harvest") have been variously explained. Jn. can hardly refer to sowing time, 9 months after the Passover of ii. 12. So the alternative explanation is preferable, that the fields were literally white, and that "4 months," etc. is a proverbial expression—sowing is followed in due course by reaping, Jesus is sowing spiritual seed, and the spiritual harvest, suggested by the ripe corn, is to be expected. This incident occupies the same relative position in the story as the plucking of the ears of corn in Mk. ii. 23.

4. In v. 1 "*a* feast" or "*the* feast," at which Jesus went to Jerusalem, is mentioned. Both readings were current at an early date; on textual grounds "*a* feast" is preferable. "*A* feast" means any of the lesser feasts, probably Pentecost. "*The* feast" is Passover, possibly Tabernacles. Some scholars think that Chapters v and vi should change positions, the MS. having suffered from displacement of sheets at an early date. If so, "*the* feast" would simply be the Passover, already referred to in vi. 4.

5. The Passover feast of vi. 4 was near when the 5000 were fed. This agrees with the received view that the Feeding of the 5000 in Mk. was in February or a little later, but its position is inconsistent with the one year theory here advocated.

6. Tabernacles is mentioned in vii. 2;

7. The Dedication (December) in x. 22;

8. The final Passover in xi. 55.

It will come as a surprise to some readers to find the Fourth Gospel used to support a one year theory. But the following harmonization of Mk. and Jn. is attractive.

Year.	*Mark.*	*Chap.*	*John.*	*Chap.*
27 Autumn	John begins to preach	i		
28 February	Jesus is baptized	i		
March-April			Passover in Jerusalem	ii
	Return to Galilee	i		iv
April-June	Passing through cornfields	ii	Fields white unto harvest	iv
May-June			A feast (Pentecost) in Jerusalem	v
September			Tabernacles in Jerusalem	vii
December			Dedication in Jerusalem	x
29 February	Feeding of 5000	vi	Feeding of 5000	vi
March-April	Last Passover		Last Passover.	

The harmony fails in two places. Mk. vii to end has to be compressed into a few weeks—this difficulty has been already dealt with—and the Feeding of the 5000 in Jn. is supposed to be out of place. This is not a serious objection. Jn. has altered the position of the Cleansing of the Temple, and the Feeding of the 5000 in itself suits the end of the Ministry, for (*a*) Eucharistic teaching is attached to it; (*b*) the people want to make Jesus King

—we naturally associate this with the demonstration which accompanied the Triumphal Entry and with the Title on the Cross. Is a year's interval, during which the authorities were inactive, likely ? (*c*) St Peter's confession, vi. 69, looks like the Johannine equivalent of Mk. viii. 29.* Perhaps the incident was brought forward in order to bring the Eucharistic lessons of vi nearer to the Baptismal teaching of iii.

The harmony given above can be adapted to a two years' ministry. But in that case Our Lord is represented as visiting Jerusalem for Passover and Pentecost of 27, and Tabernacles and Dedication of 28, and why should there be a break of over a year without any visits to Jerusalem ?

The one year ministry, if it can be derived from Mk. and Jn., is attractive, because these two Gospels and Lk. then all point in the same direction. Whether a one year Ministry is probable on other grounds is a question which will be answered differently by students. Everything recorded in the Gospels can be put into a few months; a great deal of travelling is presupposed, but not more than John Wesley would have accomplished; one year does justice to the tension which marks the records; the events of Holy Week show that the disciples had learned their lesson most imperfectly; if Jesus was what Christians believe Him to be, a year's Ministry was long enough to produce startling results; and, finally, the political situation being that described by Josephus, would the authorities have tolerated apparently subversive teaching for more than a few months ? On the other hand, on psychological grounds the training of the Twelve seems to demand a longer period than a year.†

W. K. Lowther Clarke.

* Cf. Jn. vi. 70 with Mk. viii. 33, Judas instead of Peter being identified with Satan.

† I should like to make a suggestion which I have not seen quite in this form. The author of the Fourth Gospel may have had in his sources a one year Ministry, but either he or his final editor has expanded it to three years; certainly the events recorded by him are very few for three years. If so, we may suppose that, for symbolical reasons, a scheme of $3\frac{1}{2}$ years has been super-imposed upon an original one year scheme. This would stand for the Messianic period of 1260 days in which the Kingdom of Heaven, in the persons of its representatives, is oppressed (see Rev. xi. 3, xii. 6, and cf. Mt. xi. 12). The writer reckons the Baptist's ministry as beginning 6 months before that of Jesus, which contains 4 Passovers, or 3 years. If this is right, then "*the* feast" will be original in v. 1. Did an editor put v before vi in order to get the requisite 4 Passovers for his theory ? (The stress laid on the Resurrection in v. 25 ff. is more intelligible if the feast of v. 1 is the Passover.)

English scholars are apt to dismiss such theories with impatience, but do they allow enough for the enormous importance of the complex of ideas associated with the 1260 days ? Even to-day large numbers of Christians are preoccupied with these matters. How large must they have loomed in the minds of those who first read the Apocalypse ! We have reacted from the theory that the Fourth Gospel and the Apocalypse were written by the same man, and are inclined to pay too little attention to the background of thought common to the two documents. Readers of Loisy's Commentary on St John will remember his exegesis of ii. 20 and viii. 57, which, if it could be accepted, would support the theory here sketched; see Theology x. 284.

MISCELLANEA

NOTES AND COMMENTS

Among contributors to the present issue, the Rev. V. J. K. Brook is Fellow and Dean of Lincoln College, Oxford; Mr. J. R. Mozley is the father of the Rev. J. K. Mozley, D.D., who has been a frequent writer in this Journal; and Professor E. M. O'Rorke Dickey is Professor of Fine Art at Armstrong College, Newcastle-on-Tyne.

The Expositor's Year Book (Hodder and Stoughton, 10s. 6d. net), edited by Dr. James Moffatt, contains a useful account of all the work done during the period reviewed on the interpretation of the Bible and in Biblical Theology. The survey is remarkably thorough, so far as we can judge, and is presented in a form which makes it a pleasure to read. We know of nothing else of the kind which will set the ordinary student so quickly *au courant* with new ideas, discoveries, and suggestions in biblical fields.

Voice and Verse (price 3d. net) is the organ of the British Federation of Musical Competition Festivals, and the October number contains a full account of the Summer Meeting of members held in the House of Lords under the chairmanship of Sir Henry Hadow. The discussions are of wide interest, and there seems general agreement among authorities that nothing can do more to improve the quality of singing in church than regular practice of our choirs in secular music such as the Musical Festivals afford. The address of the Secretary of the Federation is 3, Central Buildings, Westminster, S.W. 1.

Among other pamphlets we have received are *Truth and Freedom*, the well-written monthly bulletin of the Christian Evidence Society; and the Report of the Canterbury and York Society, which does an invaluable work in the publication of ecclesiastical records and deserves wider support. The offices are at 47, Carlton Avenue, London, S.E. 21.

A correspondent writes:

Dr. Moffatt's translation of the Bible, now available in one volume, will be widely quoted and used. It is an ungrateful task to pick holes in so splendid a book, but Churchmen should be warned against the tendency of certain passages. In the accounts of the Last Supper the crucial words are uniformly given as "This means my body . . . blood." Surely ἐστίν can be *translated* in no other way than "is." "Means" is an interpretation. The famous advice in 1 Tim. v. 23 to take a little wine disappears altogether from the text, a footnote suggesting that it is a gloss. Similarly in 1 Pet. iii. 19 the Descent into Hell disappears, in favour of Dr. Rendel Harris' conjecture of Enoch ('Ενὼκ καὶ for ἐν ᾧ καί); the Greek text is not even given in the footnote. Dr. Moffatt may be right in both cases, but is he fair to the unlearned reader, who may be led to think that certain readings are part of the Bible which in fact are not supported by any MS. ?

The difficulties of a modern version are overwhelming. The translator decides to replace "thou" by "you" throughout. Good, but in Matt. xiv. 33 the result is: "The men in the boat worshipped him, saying, 'You

are certainly God's Son.' " Surely here " Thou " is needed to express the sentiment of worship. But to concede it here would bring up a host of parallel passages for consideration which lie on the borderline between *Thou* and *you.*

Then how far is colloquial speech to be represented ? In Matt. xxvi. 22, 25 and parallels we find " Surely it is not me," presumably intended to represent uneducated speech, for in John vi. 20 Our Lord says " It is I." Is there not a fallacy in Dr. Moffatt's principle of colloquial English ? Granted that the disciples used everyday language in speaking to their Master, the original Aramaic is lost. The document to be translated is, let us say, St Matthew, a Greek work intended to be read at services when the congregation *worshipped* the Lord Jesus. St Paul's Epistles, too, were meant to be read " in Church." In both cases the writers were using the best Greek at their disposal, we may be sure. Does colloquial English represent this ? Notice, too, how large a part of the New Testament is phrased in Septuagint language, that is in the language of a sacred book. Does everyday English successfully render this ? If not, should not all St Luke's writings, which most of all are " biblical " in style, be translated in a manner appropriate to those parts which are based on the LXX ?

NOTE

THE 133RD PSALM

[according to Gunkel's exegesis, see *Die Psalmen*, Part 6, Vanderhoeck und Ruprecht. 1926].

1. *Behold, how good and pleasant it is when brethren dwell together.*— Here we have the old custom of " the great family," when brothers instead of parting at marriage or their father's death lived on together, sharing the family possessions. So Abram and Lot at first " dwelt together " (Gen. xiii. 6). The levirate custom, referred to in Deut. xxv. 5, applied not universally, but only " if brethren dwell together." Saul's family seems to have belonged to this type (1 Sam. x. 14). The Psalmist praises an old custom, now in danger of becoming obsolete.

2. *Like the precious oil on the head which flows down to the beard ; like Aaron's beard flowing down to the border of his clothes ;* 3. *Like the dew of Hermon which flows down to the hills of Zion.* This united family life is compared to three things, each of which has the property of extending its benefits to others. Oil poured on the head penetrates to the beard. The mention of the beard suggests Aaron's beard, which was never cut (Lev. xxi. 5). The beard was a mark of dignity; flowing down to the collar which surrounded the opening of the priestly garment (Ex. xxviii. 32), it ennobled it. So in a hot summer the dew collected on mighty Hermon and fed the brooks which watered the lower hills. The psalm will have been originally one of Northern Israel. Perhaps Ijon (1 Kings xv. 20, 2 Kings xv. 29) was originally written and the familiar Zion was substituted when the psalm was adapted for use in Judah.

4. *For there* (in the undivided family) *has Yahweh promised blessing and life for evermore.*

Does not this restoration of the original meaning give more point to the familiar application of the psalm to life in the Church ?

W. K. L. C.

STUDIES IN TEXTS

The Building and the Body (Eph. ii. 21 f., iv. 16.; Col. ii. 19).

The passages referred to in the heading of this Note are usually taken as dwelling on the inter-relation of the different parts of the Body of Christ, rather than on the relation of the whole Body to its Head. This interpretation is, perhaps, chiefly due to an appearance which the participles employed have of connoting a "fitting and knitting *together*," an appearance which breaks down when they are examined more closely. The fact that those participles are in the *present* tense has also been obscured both in Latin and English versions. Their tense has great significance if they refer to union with Christ, while the perfect participles, which are substituted for them in the Latin and English versions, accord with, and have helped to maintain, the current interpretation of these passages. That interpretation is open to objection on the following grounds:

1. It fails to recognize *πᾶν τὸ σῶμα* and *πᾶσα οἰκοδομή* as *collective* terms. It interprets St. Paul's words as though he had written *πάντα τὰ μέλη* and *πάντες οἱ λίθοι* as the subjects of his sentences.

2. It leaves *ἡ κεφαλὴ* (*τὴν κεφαλήν*) and *ἀκρογωνιαίου* in isolation, allowing them no real influence on the following clauses.

3. It forces a sense on *συνβιβάζειν* other than that which it bears in Classical Greek; and other than the sense which it uniformly bears in the Greek Bible.

4. It is driven to understand the words *διὰ πάσης ἁφῆς τῆς ἐπιχορηγίας* in a forced and unnatural manner.

5. It treats the participles as though they were perfect, not present.

Does the structure and context of the passages under consideration lead us to think that they speak of adaptation to and harmony with Christ, and are therefore in accord with the main thought of these Letters?

(*a*) In Eph. ii. 21 *συναρμολογουμένη* describes, I believe, the structural attachment or adaptation of the whole Building to the Corner Stone. The word *could*, of course, describe the fitting of stone to stone, but the collective *πᾶσα οἰκοδομή* points to a collective adaptation, and the dominance of *ἀκρογωνιαίου* over the ensuing clause almost requires that *συναρμολογουμένη* should describe the progressive fitting of the whole Body to the Corner Stone. The fitting is progressive, not only or chiefly through the building on of fresh blocks, but through the growing firmness and completeness of the union.

(*b*) There is, however, a very signal aspect of the Church's ever-growing adaptation to Christ which the metaphor of the Corner Stone is inadequate to express. The other stones are well and truly laid *once for all*. There can be no progress in their conformity to the position and line of the Corner Stone.

May it not have been to bring out this aspect that the Apostle leaves the figure of the Corner Stone and Building for that of the Head and the Body? The Body *can*, as the Building *cannot*, become increasingly in harmony with the Head. Its movements may come to be more and more in accordance with the will of the Head.

And St. Paul finds ready to his hand a verb which exactly expresses the brain's direction of the body. *Συνβιβάζειν*, which in Classical Greek means to *reconcile* persons at variance, is used several times in the

LXX, and always in the sense of God *guiding* His servants, and of His servants guiding His people, in the path of His will. "Reconciling" and "directing" are two ways of doing what the verb literally signifies, *causing to step with* (another). This is precisely how the will or the brain deals with the body.

So in Eph. iv. 16 St. Paul adds *συνβιβαζόμενον* to *συναρμολογούμενον*. Not only is the whole Body brought into ever firmer structural adherence to Christ, not only is every "living stone" in line with Him, but the whole Body is ever more and more "brought into harmony" with Him—ever guided and directed by Him, so that its steps are led more and more along the path along which He would have it go.

Both the progressive structural adhesion to Christ (*συναρμολόγησις*) and the progressive adaptation to Christ's will (*συνβίβασις*) are maintained "by means of full contact with the supply" that is in Christ (*διὰ πάσης ἁφῆς τῆς ἐπιχορηγιάς*).

(*c*) In Col. ii. 19 *συναρμολογούμενον* disappears altogether, and the constant receiving of direction or guidance is joined with the constant receiving of all else that the Body needs (*ἐπιχορηγούμενον καὶ συνβιβαζόμενον*). First the receiving of all that is required for the supply of the Body's need is mentioned, and then the receiving of direction and guidance in the use of the power bestowed.

The interpretation of these passages may seriously affect the scope of our endeavours after unity. The tendency of the current view of their meaning is to lead the different parts of divided Christendom to search for ways of drawing together. The view here set forth would bid us all seek closer union with Christ, and a more complete understanding of and harmony with His will. In doing this we shall find ourselves drawn together by being drawn to Him.

G. H. Whitaker.

REVIEWS

PLATO, THE MAN AND HIS WORK. By A. E. Taylor. Methuen. Pp. 522. 21s.

This is, I think, a great book, an honour to Oxford, to the Scottish Universities, and to British scholarship. Professors Taylor and Burnet are our two leading Platonists. They were colleagues for many years at St. Andrews, and have collaborated in cordial friendship. Professor Burnet is said to know the text of Plato almost by heart; Professor Taylor is a metaphysician who began as a disciple of Bradley and Bosanquet, and has thought out his way to an orthodox Christian philosophy. His knowledge not only of Plato but of the later writers of the Platonic school is very minute and thorough.

The peculiar strength of Professor Taylor's position as an interpreter of Plato is that he sees in him one of the founders of Catholic philosophy and theology. For him Greek philosophy did not die when it became a religion—as it has done already in Plato—nor when, after Porphyry, its deepest current began to enrich the great river of Christianity. From Plato and Aristotle to St. Thomas Aquinas there is no real break, except that caused by the Dark Ages, in the great debate. This conviction that Platonism is a living faith does not conflict with his determination to set Plato in the right historical perspective, and not to trim his thought "to suit the tastes of a modern neo-Kantian, neo-Hegelian, or neo-realist." He offers an analysis of the Dialogues, not a systematization of their contents; "Plato hated nothing more than system-making." But he does, quite rightly, expound the Dialogues in modern philosophical language. If he does not find much post-Kantian speculation in Plato, he would probably say that the unfortunate neglect of scholastic philosophy in modern times has made a break in the chain that links us with the latest and ripest developments of classical thought, which were inspired by Plato.

I am sorry that I can contribute nothing more useful than warm appreciation and admiration. But my own opinions about Plato have been much influenced by the work of these two scholars, and I find myself in complete agreement with Professor Taylor on almost every point. It is a very small criticism that I am afraid he has taken far too favourable a view of the state of public opinion at Athens on the unpleasant subject of pæderasty. Plato in his own age had quite made up his mind that the practice should not be tolerated in an ideal commonwealth; but he would never have walked out of the room in disgust,

as Plotinus did when he heard it defended. The love of boys at Athens, as in the Greek world generally, was very much more than an imitation of a Dorian camp-vice. It was not till the first half of the third century, between Marcus Aurelius and Plotinus, that public opinion turned decisively against it in pagan circles. Christianity was probably one of the factors in producing the change.

It is curious to note that the contemporaries of the Tübingen school of New Testament criticism were equally drastic in impugning the authenticity of many of Plato's Dialogues, and that modern scholarship has reinstated nearly the whole Corpus of Plato as well as nearly all the Pauline Epistles. Alcibiades II., like 2 Peter, must be thrown to the wolves, but opinion is growing steadily more favourable to the important Letters of Plato, which we should all like to believe genuine. Real light is thrown upon Plato as a writer and as a man by the remarkable passage in the Seventh Letter, which Professor Taylor quotes in a note: "There does not exist, and there never shall, any treatise by myself on these matters [especially on 'the Good']. The subject does not admit, as the sciences in general do, of exposition. It is only after a long association in the great business itself, and a shared life, that a light breaks out in the soul, kindled, so to say, by a leaping flame, and thereafter feeds itself." And in the Second Letter he answers a question which has been very often discussed. "I have never myself written a word on these topics, and there neither is nor ever shall be any treatise by Plato; what now bears the name belongs to Socrates beautified and rejuvenated." In the first of these passages there speaks a mystic, not a professor of systematic philosophy; and we cannot doubt that here speaks the real Plato, whom Plotinus justly venerated as a master and a kindred spirit.

Plato is one of those thinkers who "grow old learning always many things." He was not a philosopher like Lotze, who seems to have completed his intellectual system while still young. And like Socrates himself, he wishes us to think for ourselves about the "tendance of the soul," which is the great business of life, not to do our thinking for us. In philosophy, as he understands it, no man may deliver his brother, or make agreement unto God for him. The vision is for him only who will devote his life to preparing for it, making his sojourn here a daily "rehearsal" of death—a dying life, always rising again into something higher.

In this book we hear nothing, or next to nothing, about "Platonic dualism," "Greek intellectualism," "self-centred morality," "the confounding of sin with ignorance." These time-honoured misunderstandings of Plato are for the most

part left to confute themselves, and we may hope that they will soon cease to be commonplaces of shallow criticism. "Dualism" is in point of fact vulgarized Platonism, and some members of the school were not guiltless of letting it pass as good enough for the masses. The result has been a widespread error about the master's teaching.

Professor Taylor is no doubt right in rejecting the idea of an Evil World-Soul as unPlatonic. But we shall not think worse of Plato as a thinker if he did dally with the temptation to admit an evil element into his higher cosmic principles. Plotinus would not have prayed, like St. Paul, to be delivered from all defilements of flesh *and spirit;* but can morality be wholly in earnest without feeling that our warfare is not only against flesh and blood?

The question of reincarnation is very difficult. Our author thinks that "that doctrine is no part of the serious convictions of Socrates or Plato." The Neoplatonists were doubtful how far the doctrine ought to be taken seriously, and were at least inclined to relegate to the region of myth the belief that human beings may be reincarnated as animals or birds. But the question is intimately connected with the Platonic belief in immortality. Professor Taylor is, I am sure, right in saying that in Plato the decisive argument for immortality is that the soul is intrinsically divine, belonging to the higher world; and that for a Greek divinity meant *immortality* and not much else. But pre-existence and post-existence, for Greek thought, stand or fall together. The notion that the human soul springs into being out of nothingness at one moment, and is "launched into eternity" at another, can never have been accepted by Plato, even as a possibility.

The account of the martyrdom of Socrates is admirable. On the causes of his condemnation Professor Taylor and Professor Burnet entirely agree, and their arguments seem to me convincing. There was never a truer martyr than Socrates. The Athenians did not mean to kill him; "but it is not the business of the martyr to make things easy for the forces of consciences." One thing Socrates seems *not* to have thought about, namely, that he was almost forcing his country to disgrace itself in the eyes of all future generations.

We are allowed to see how Nietzsche with his superman, Huxley with his epiphenomenalism, and the Pragmatists in the person of Protagoras, all cross the stage in Plato's Dialogues. And we are shown convincingly that the preference of "contemplation" to "action" hits, not the intelligent and energetic worker, but only the thoughtless busybody.

I quote a few sentences from page 192, as peculiarly illu-

minating on the whole standpoint of this book. "Under all the real differences due to the Christian's belief in the historical reality of the God-Man, the ideal of Socrates and the Christian ideal are fundamentally identical. The central thought in both cases is that man is born a creature of temporality and mutability into a temporal and mutable environment. But in virtue of the fact that there is a something divine in him, he cannot but aspire to a good which is above time and mutability, and that the right life is from first to last a process by which the merely secular and temporal self is remade in the likeness of the eternal. . . . A creature whose well-being consists in living for an eternal good cannot be a mere thing of time and change. On this sense the morality of the Platonic dialogues, like all morality which can command an intelligent man's respect, is from first to last other-worldly." Of course, this does not mean that Plato ever believed in the immortality of the entire man—spirit, soul and body.

The myths are not very fully discussed. Perhaps their chief value is in showing that, for Plato, there are some great truths which even a philosopher can apprehend only with the help of poetry, symbol, and imagination, which are for many the natural language of religion.

I do not entirely share Professor Taylor's affection for the *Laws*. It is the least charming of all the Dialogues, including even the desperately obscure *Timæus*, in which Proclus thought he found an inexhaustible mine of profound wisdom. And it is very difficult to forgive Plato for wishing to found a Holy Inquisition, which was to treat three classes of offenders—Atheists, Epicureans, and, as Whittaker maliciously suggests, *Catholics*, with a rigour which would have almost satisfied Torquemada. Still, I quite agree that this important work has been too much neglected.

I warmly congratulate Professor Taylor on the successful completion of a work which must have cost him immense labour, though it was a labour of love. All lovers of Plato are deeply indebted to him.

W. R. Inge.

Francesco Petrarca, the First Modern Man of Letters. His Life and Correspondence. A Study of the Early Fourteenth Century (1304-1347). By Edward H. R. Tatham, M.A., F.S.A. Vol. I., Early Years and Lyric Poems; Vol. II., Secluded Study and Public Fame. Sheldon Press. 18s. net each volume.

It is an honour in English scholarship to find a canon and country parson continuing in these hurried days the tradition

of two centuries ago, when English students won high rank by their interpretation of Italian writers. Canon Tatham has been a scholar all his life. How many years ago is it since he won the Lothian prize at Oxford for a serious essay on John Sobieski? That can only have taken a year to write. These two volumes on Petrarch have taken perhaps twenty years to write, and (if I understand the preface to Vol. I. rightly) there are two more to come. Really it will be a stupendous book, great in the width and solidity of its learning as well as in its length and the comprehensiveness of its scope. Earlier English writers must seem negligible in comparison with this book. Canon Tatham rightly commends Mrs. Dobson's Life (I have used the two volumes of 1797) while stating that it is derived for the most part from the Abbé de Sade. I do not see that he says anything about the Master of the Temple's bright and clever translation of the three dialogues called *The Secretum*, to which there is a charming preface. This, while we remember Mr. Jerrold and Mr. Hollway-Calthrop, should not be forgotten. But nothing in English can approach the excellence of Canon Tatham's book. It is really a study of the literary history of a great part of the fourteenth century, illustrated as (I think I may say) it has never been illustrated before by a practically complete study of Petrarch's letters. For a study of his books, prose and poetry, we must wait for the later volumes. I earnestly hope these may not be long delayed; for it is very difficult to estimate the permanent value of a book designed on this scale when only half of it has appeared. I hesitate to attempt anything like a complete review, which at present could only be inadequate and very likely misleading. But I may point out to students of Italian literature—and every student ought to read the book—that it is very much more than a literary essay or estimate. It is, as the author admits and defends, a History of the Life and Times. There are defects inevitable in such a survey. There is a real danger of the greatness of the individual being dwarfed by the world-wide interests of the time; and, in the study of a period so distant, for which the original authorities are not, after all, very numerous, there seems an impossibility of avoiding the frequent use of such phrases as "it seems to me that" or "must have been," which are not far removed from guesses, however good guesses they may be. When I have said this and noted (to myself) a few printer's errors, I cannot find another word to say of the work which is not in its condign praise.

As it proceeds, the book grows in interest—I may say, for myself, in fascination. The chapters about Education and the Universities, and the Troubadours, are especially good. Through-

out all sorts of interesting points and elucidations keep cropping up. In regard to the poet's relations with Laura, I could wish that Canon Tatham did not seem to neglect the view of the Master of the Temple. Of a very different kind is the lengthy and acute analysis of "the character of his love" and of the *Canzoniere*. From this we pass to a more detailed examination of the poet's life and of the history of his time. This continues down to 1347 and is extraordinarily minute, careful, critical, and complete. As I write this I am reading that curious and (it must be admitted) dull book *de Remediis utriusque Fortunæ*, and should like to know what Canon Tatham thinks of it. But I must wait; and when the book is finished I may be able better to express my opinion of it. Meanwhile I offer homage to the author of a learned and important book.

The title given to its subject by Canon Tatham must remain a matter for discussion. Was Petrarch the first modern man of letters? If the expression is used, as it well may be, disparagingly, the answer may be yes. Petrarch was a book-maker who wrote very largely for the pleasure of making books, and perhaps secondarily for the sake of instructing people, didactically and egotistically, rather than because of a compelling necessity of his nature. He was a very facile writer: he would have made a great newspaper writer, a composer of *causeries*, a reflector of current tendencies. Was he a genius? Canon Tatham hardly tries to convince us that he was. Yet he was a master of many kinds of writing. To compare him with Dante is absurd. He had hardly even the grace of Ariosto. But yet he was thoroughly "modern," and in that "a man of letters." Of the religious side of his life much more remains to be said.

W. H. Hutton.

Confirmation: or, the Laying On of Hands. Vol. I., Historical and Doctrinal. S.P.C.K. 12s. 6d.

Almost everything that anyone wants to know about Confirmation is contained in this book, except a clear definition of what Confirmation is. And that is the crucial difficulty of the subject, both theologically and practically. Many of the Anglican clergymen for whom the volume is primarily intended will be disconcerted to find that the normal doctrine on the subject springs from the corrupt following of a mistake made by St. Thomas Aquinas (p. 291); and amongst the disconcerted will be at least one of the contributors to this work.

In form the book is a collection of eight essays; but the main body of it—more than half—consists of Canon Ollard's history

of Confirmation as administered in the Anglican communion from 1500 to 1850. This is preceded by two essays—"Laying on of Hands in the N.T.," by Dr. Lowther Clarke, and "The Theory and Practice on Confirmation in the Church up to the Reformation," by the Bishop of Moray, Ross, and Caithness—and followed by five, which deal, respectively, with "Confirmation Rites" (Dr. C. L. Feltoe); "Confirmation in Churches of the Latin Rite" (T. J. Hardy); "The Eastern Orthodox Church" (R. M. French); "The Relation of Confirmation to Baptism" (K. D. Mackenzie), and "The Theological Implications of Confirmation" (Dr. H. M. Relton).

Canon Ollard divides his story into six periods. The first is from 1500 to the accession of Queen Elizabeth in 1558. A questionnaire issued to certain divines on the subject of Confirmation, among others, in 1537, yielded some interesting results. Cranmer apparently regarded the rite as neither sacramental nor Apostolic; but the general opinion, as incorporated in "The Bishops' Book," was much more conservative. A later discussion drew out certain points more clearly; the laying on of hands being accepted as the "matter" of the sacrament, and chrism as its traditional accompaniment. The "King's Book" of 1543 embodied these conclusions. The 1543 Prayer Book omitted chrism and added a catechism, but made no vital change. Nor did it satisfy the more radical spirits in the reforming party.

In the second period, from 1558 to 1597, we naturally find much unsatisfactory teaching about Confirmation. "The Prayer Book taught one thing," remarks Canon Ollard, "while various divines in high places were singing to it a descant which was, in fact, composed upon a different and more Protestant tune." The great Bishop Jewel gives a "purely mythical" account of the origin of the rite, and Cranmer does the same; future English bishops, as yet in exile at Frankfort, abandoned Confirmation altogether; even Whitgift, in his defence of it, takes the merely subjective view, and shrinks from claiming Apostolic sanction. Episcopal visitation articles in this period suggest that a knowledge of the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Decalogue was frequently regarded as a sufficient justification for admission to communion.

The third period, 1597-1633, opens strongly with the publication of Hooker's Fifth Book. Here at last is a sane, courageous, and Catholic exposition of Confirmation, laying full stress on the objective side of it, and ranking the authority of St. Luke above that of Calvin. The Canons of 1603 provide for the regular administration of the rite by the bishops, and due preparation for it; the objecting Puritans were overruled at the Hampton Court Conference, but did a good deal in practice

to subvert the teaching of the Prayer Book. The tide, however, had turned; indeed, in many parts of England the number of candidates was such that Confirmation was administered with indecent haste.

The revival increased in strength during the fourth period, 1633-1660, which begins with the primacy of Laud. In 1640 " the official teaching of the Church in the Prayer Book and its support in the Canons . . . was solemnly and unanimously affirmed by the Bishops." Canon Ollard draws attention to the significance of Juxon's visitation articles, which became standard for the Church of England in general, and dealt very carefully with Catechism and Confirmation; and he sketches the important theological contributions to the subject made by Cosin, Hall, and Hammond.

The fifth period, 1660-1688, is marked by a renewed statement of Puritan objections to Confirmation at the Savoy Conference; the final revision of the Confirmation service; and the great works of Thorndike and Jeremy Taylor, of which Canon Ollard gives a most valuable outline. Visitation articles of the period show the Bishops insisting on the importance of Confirmation, and Catholic, with a few exceptions, in their theological interpretation of the rite.

The Revolution in 1688, with which Canon Ollard's sixth and last period begins, left the Church weakened by the secession of the Non-Jurors, and by the political supremacy of Latitudinarian Whiggery. Bull and Beveridge, indeed, were bishops under Queen Anne; but Burnet is far more typical of the time, and his view of Confirmation is purely subjective. Beveridge himself was succeeded at St. Asaph by Fleetwood, whose visitation charge leaves, says Canon Ollard, " a general impression of being lectures on Pastoral Theology delivered by a benevolent layman with a considerable leaning towards the Church of England." Confirmation he frankly and officially ruled to be quite superfluous; an opinion which found its best-known advocate in Hoadly. It is not surprising that preparation for Confirmation dropped out of existence as the eighteenth century went on, while the administration of the rite became careless and even scandalous. This state of things continued well into the nineteenth century; the depths of degradation reached at Ely in 1833, as recounted by the Rev. William Cecil, are almost beyond belief. " Improvement came slowly, and, at first, from the Evangelicals." But the great remodeller of Confirmation methods was Bishop Samuel Wilberforce; and we are grateful to Canon Ollard for reminding us of this easily forgotten debt.

The whole history of the theory and practice of Confirmation through the 350 years is most admirably presented in this essay.

Canon Ollard's immense industry in research has not affected his power to tell an interesting story, packed as it is with things new and old brought forth out of a copious treasure. What might easily have became a mere chronicle in less skilful hands is here set before us in a vivid narrative which ought to attract and instruct a large circle of readers.

We turn now to the liturgical essays of the book. Two of these are very brief, and "intended to give those whose main interest lies in the Anglican system a little information about other parts of the Church." This task is simply and straightforwardly accomplished by Mr. T. J. Hardy, who deals with the Latin rite; and Mr. R. M. French, who describes the practice of the Orthodox Church. For the benefit of some readers of the book it might have been better if Mr. Hardy had given us the Roman rite in English instead of Latin. The most important points to notice here are that in the Roman view the *matter* of the Sacrament is "imposition of (the Bishop's) hands* with chrism," and the *recipients* are baptized persons of an age not less than seven years; while in the Orthodox Church chrism (administered by the priest, but previously blessed by the Patriarch) has *replaced* the Apostolic laying on of hands; and the *recipients* of the sacrament are normally infants, as it follows Baptism immediately, without a break. This last point is too often left out of sight by apologists for Confirmation.

The short essay on "Confirmation Rites" is, alas, a posthumous work of that fine scholar and true priest, Dr. C. L. Feltoe: *cuius animæ propitietur Deus*. His first section traces the use of the two main ceremonies of unction and the laying on of hands as employed in Confirmation rites; and he finds that "except in Apostolic times, unction has not infrequently been practised without imposition, and never imposition without unction until the Reformation"—a possible reason being that the ceremony of imposition of hands was used in various ways apart from Confirmation. It seems clear to Dr. Feltoe, though we should not have inferred this from Mr. Hardy, that the raising and extension of the Bishop's hands towards the candidates in the Latin rite is the lineal but attenuated successor of the original imposition—*i.e.*, the manual act performed by the Bishop in anointing is not the authentic "laying on of hands." (This is one of several points in which the book would have gained in clearness by more collaboration between the various writers.)

Dr. Feltoe's second section (3½ pp. only) deals with the English rite, and includes some shrewd criticisms of the 1662 alterations. A still briefer section on "Protestant Usages"

* But on this see further below.

follows; and a valuable appendix exhibits some typical rites (here all in Latin) more or less in full.

The Bishop of Moray's essay on "The Theory and Practice of Confirmation in the Church up to the Reformation" compresses into a short compass a vast amount of useful learning. Much in it will appeal specially to liturgical students; but his main thesis can be followed by readers not thus qualified, and is of great practical importance. Confirmation is the complement of immersion, but "the rite is one." Unction in connection with Baptism is almost universal from at least sub-apostolic times. Universal also in the earliest ages was the laying on of the hand (generally singular, in spite of N.T. usage); but this custom decayed very widely, and quite early in the East. But whatever outward sign was used, the intention remained the same: Confirmation was for the gift of the Holy Spirit; "though, since immersion, unction, and the laying on of the hand were properly one rite, there was not complete unanimity as to the proper effect of each of these three parts." The separation between Immersion and Confirmation which grew up in the West was due to the comparative inaccessibility of bishops, and not in the first place to any theory about "years of discretion."

What, then, is the relation of Confirmation to Baptism? Mr. Mackenzie, in ten competent but elusive pages, replies in effect that we really cannot say. He shows clearly enough the difficulty of maintaining that Baptism effects precisely *this* and Confirmation precisely *that*, however the *this* and *that* may be defined. But his treatment would have been more satisfactory if he had emphasized—like Dr. Maclean in the words quoted above, or like Mr. N. P. Williams in his discussion of "Initiation" in *Essays Catholic and Critical*—the essential oneness of Immersion and its complement. His exegesis of two passages in Acts would have profited by consultation with Dr. Lowther Clarke: contrast p. 287 with p. 17, on Acts ii. 28, and p. 230 with p. 6, on Acts ix. 17 *f.*

Dr. Lowther Clarke's own essay, on "Laying on of Hands in the N.T." is a perfectly admirable piece of work, and valuable out of all proportion to its length. Fine examples of his invariably penetrating skill in exegesis will be found in the passages referred to above; for the rest we must content ourselves here with two quotations. (1) Most of us are content to cite Acts viii. as our earliest authority for the rite of Confirmation. Some scholars question the validity of appealing to that chapter at all in this way; Dr. Lowther Clarke not only allows it, but takes us one stage further back. "Until evidence to the contrary is produced," he writes, "we shall believe that the first Confirmation took place, not at Samaria, but at Jeru-

salem on the day of Pentecost, and that it was conducted by the Twelve Apostles. We are not told in so many words that the administration of the rite was confined to the Apostles and those to whom they delegated their authority, but it is highly probable. There is no evidence to show that anyone else confirmed." (2) On the relation between Baptism and Confirmation, he says: "The two Sacraments are separate theoretically in that they represent the negative and positive sides of Christian initiation. . . . Nevertheless, the unity of Baptism and Confirmation is more fundamental than their distinction. To us in the Western Church they inevitably appear as two; but they are two flowers growing out of a single root."*

The concluding essay, Dr. Relton's "Theological Implications of Confirmation," is not impressive. The best part of it is the short section on "Postulates of a Christian Philosophy." The pages which follow, on the Person and Work of the Holy Spirit, are largely an exposition of Dr. Bushnell, and though containing true and valuable thoughts, seem to be somewhat unguarded in expression—*e.g.*, "the suffering God," and the Holy Spirit spoken of as "*becoming* . . . an invisible, diffusive, pervasive, everywhere present, always-abiding Christ" (italics ours). The section on "The Sacramental Principle" tells us nothing that the reader of a book like this will not already know—at least in nine cases out of ten; while Dr. Relton's plea for the reasonableness of regarding Confirmation as sacramental seems dangerously to depend on the age of the candidates: "young people just entering into the larger world of temptation, and upon the more serious tasks of life." The penultimate section raises hopes by its title, "Practical Significance of Confirmation"; but in it Confirmation is practically insignificant, though the general theme of our dependence on the Holy Spirit is truly and finely indicated.

The book as a whole is very far from being a unity, and might have been very much improved by a preliminary agreement amongst the contributors—which need by no means have been narrow or rigid—on the essential nature of Confirmation. As it stands, there are too many contradictions. But there is so much of high value that the book is well worth reading and possessing.

ERIC GRAHAM.

* It is not the reviewer's business to notice misprints; but we must call attention to the misleading "Not the passive" for "Note the passive" in footnote 5 on p. 8.

English Mediæval Painted Glass. By J. D. Le Couteur. S.P.C.K. With Illustrations. 8s. 6d.

This is a most excellent book, the work of a man who had made himself a leading authority on the subject by twenty years of careful and most intelligent observation, backed by a real enthusiasm. Mr. G. McN. Rushforth, who revised and prepared the book for the press, contributes a very graphic and sympathetic little sketch of Mr. Le Couteur's work and character, which, so far as the work is concerned —for I knew him only by correspondence—I can sincerely endorse.

The volume is a thoroughly adequate guide to the study of ancient painted glass in England. It begins at the beginning, tells us how a painted window is made, in a plain, practical way, and then takes us through the several stages of the evolution of the art, from Norman times to the Gothic revival. There is no preciosity, no pontificality. Everything is straightforward and simple, yet there is no lack of learning.

Some vulgar errors are dispelled very effectively. We should not speak of *stained* windows; the monks were not the makers of windows; the craftsmen cannot be said to have worked in the Ruskinian spirit; not all the destruction of glass in post-Reformation times was wrought by Cromwell's people, though in all conscience they did enough.

A vast deal of positive information, too, is supplied. Mr. J. A. Knowles's discovery, as it may well be called, that the reason why the use of enamel as opposed to pot metal became very general in the late sixteenth century was that the glass-making towns in Lorraine were destroyed by the French—this discovery is duly emphasized. But, indeed, it is out of the question to try to estimate the amount of new matter which is to be found between these covers.

Readers may welcome, or at worst pardon, a few scattered remarks.

I have always been principally interested in the subjects, as distinct from the technique, of the ancient windows, and I find in the chapter on Subjects some corrections to make. The *Speculum Humanæ Salvationis* has *three* types to an antitype, the *Biblia Pauperum*, *two* (p. 47). And both these books are of the early fourteenth century, so that the Canterbury type-windows (which I am interested to see assigned to the twelfth century) cannot be copied therefrom. Another set of *Biblia Pauperum* windows, it ought to be added, was at Tattershall; relics of it are not only at St. Martin's, Stamford, but also at Burghley House. The Lincoln panels (p. 49) are undoubtedly from a set of types.

The *Fifteen Signs* window at All Saints', York, is no doubt taken from the *Prick of Conscience*, but that poem was not written by Rolle of Hampole; the Fifteen Signs are derived from a short writing falsely ascribed to Jerome, who is there said to have found them "in the annals of the Hebrews"; they must, in fact, have been taken from a lost Apocalypse.

The Greystoke window illustrates the adventures of SS. Andrew and Matthew in the land of the anthropophagi, narrated first in the Greek Acts of Andrew and Matthew, and later in Cynewulf's poem of Andreas.

The supposed Dance of Death panel in St. Andrew the Great at Norwich is in reality the picture of a miracle of St. Fridolin, who revived a corpse to make it arbitrate in a disputed will case. Doubtless it is foreign glass, and an importation. The Heydon window described by Blomefield was meant to set forth the injuries inflicted on Christ by those who swore by different parts of His body; a wall-painting at Broughton, Bucks, illustrates the same theme.

The late Lincoln College, Oxford, windows, and perhaps those at Wadham, are taken direct from engravings—whether by Sadeler or van den Passe I cannot at the moment make sure.

But enough of small, possibly pedantic, corrections. I have nothing but praise for the book.

M. R. James.

NOTICES

THE IMPASSIBILITY OF GOD. A Survey of Christian Thought. By J. K. Mozley, D.D. Cambridge University Press. 7s. 6d.

We must congratulate Dr. Mozley both on his doctorate and on the thesis by which he obtained it. The book, he tells us, has grown out of the task assigned to him by the Archbishops' Doctrinal Commission "to prepare an historical statement on the subject of the doctrine of the Impassibility of God." Within the limits that he has imposed upon himself, it is an admirable piece of work and fittingly represents that sound learning which was once the glory of the English Church. The treatment is, in the main, historical, though it is interspersed with shrewd criticisms which show the line of solution which the author would himself be inclined to adopt. The book is not one to be read lightly, and the style is not always of the clearest, but it puts together a mass of material that no future writer on the subject can afford to ignore. It clearly represents the fruit of much study. We only hope that the author will find time to develop the lines of thought that he suggests at the close of the book. Though he does not attempt a formal solution of the problem, the work, at least, has this great value for the immediate present that it shows the complexity of the whole question, and the futility of short and easy answers. We cannot be content with an appeal to a dictum of St. Thomas Aquinas, on the one hand, or to the emotions of the modern man on the other. Nor can we dismiss with a cheery contempt the statements of the great thinkers of the past, even though they were ignorant of the blessed word evolution. For example, as Dr. Mozley points out at the end, the question of what we mean by the suffering of God raises the fundamental issue as to the possibility of identifying the Absolute of the philosophers with the God of religion. Our only complaint with the method of treatment adopted is that it often compels the writer to stop short just when he becomes most interesting. The chief omission that we can find is that he makes no mention of the influence of psychology, whether for good or evil, upon modern theological thought. When psychologists tend to decry reason and to lay stress on instinct and emotion, they inevitably lead men not only to undervalue the importance of their own reasoning powers, but to imagine the Supreme Being behind the world no longer in terms of intellect, but of vitality, if not of emotion. Perhaps when Dr. Mozley produces his *magnum opus* on the subject, he will find room for a full consideration of the difficulty.

E. J. BICKNELL.

A RECONSTRUCTION OF THE OLD-LATIN TEXT OR TEXTS OF THE GOSPELS USED BY SAINT AUGUSTINE, WITH A STUDY OF THEIR CHARACTER. By C. M. Milne, M.A. Cambridge, at the University Press. 10s. 6d.

Mr. Milne's title-page does an injustice to his work. It would be a comparatively easy matter, with patient industry, to collect all St. Augustine's quotations from the Gospels, to compare these with the not very numerous extant manuscripts of the Old Latin version, and so to arrive approximately at the text which he habitually read. But Mr. Milne has attempted much more. He has tried to get into Augustine's

study, to watch him at his work, to ascertain where he verifies his citations, where he deliberately selects a reading, and where he trusts his memory. He does not expatiate on the results; they are presented in tabular form, with every possible abbreviation, so that the use of them involves an effort faintly reflecting that by which they were achieved. Nothing could be more satisfactory; the reader shares the pleasure and the merit of discovery.

Most of the variants exhibited are mere facts, of little or no significance; but even these when tabulated can be made to yield some information. One broad statement Mr. Milne makes without producing his evidence, but citing the support of Professor Burkitt; after the year 401, he says, there is a perceptible increase in the use made by Augustine of the Vulgate. This might be expected. Jerome's revision of the four Gospels was presented to Damasus in the year 383, with the Letter usually printed in the Vulgate by way of Preface, in which he characteristically exaggerated the varieties of the existing versions, "tot pæne quot codices," and temerariously claimed to have altered nothing apart from sentences "quæ sensum uidebantur mutare." At this very time Augustine, sick of Manichæism but not yet persuaded to be a Christian, was in Rome, where furious disputes were raging about the person and the work of Jerome. Mr. Milne does not consider the possibility of his having been interested, and the state of weary scepticism in which he then was makes it unlikely. But five years later he was again in Rome, a Christian, writing his first treatise against the Manichæans and the book *De Libero Arbitrio*. In the former of these Mr. Milne finds an exact balance of reference; in seven quotations there is agreement with the Old Latin against Jerome, and in seven others with Jerome against the Old Latin. There is the same exact balance in *De Vera Religione*, written a year or two later in Africa, and in two other treatises of the same date containing few quotations. In eight of the earlier works there is the slightest possible leaning to the Old Latin, and in four a slight preference for Jerome. But in the Confessions the Old Latin has a decided preponderance, and in *De Sermone Domini*, in *Contra Adimantum*, and *Quæstiones Euangeliorum*, Jerome is well to the fore in numerous quotations. Then comes *De Consensu Euangelistarum* in which, of course, they abound; and here Jerome carries all before him. The inference seems to be that the Old Latin Gospels were constantly being read, and their phrasing was well rooted in Augustine's memory, but that in close work on the text he kept Jerome's version beside him for reference. Mr. Milne borrows from Professor Burkitt a happy comparison with the use of the Revised Version by English theologians. He has not extended his minute analysis to works written after the year 401. It was two years later that Augustine wrote to Jerome objecting to his versions of books of the Old Testament from the Hebrew, and flavouring the complaint with a rather patronizing approval of the version of the Gospels, where "pæne in omnibus nulla offensio est." We know how the lion of Bethlehem roared on the receipt of this epistle.

It is interesting to observe that Augustine ignores Jerome's strange and mischievous aberration—if indeed it be his, and not a corruption of his text—*unum ouile* in John x. 16. In *De Consensu*, where "it is all but indisputable," says Mr. Milne, "that Augustine used the Vulgate of set purpose and with deliberate care," he quotes "ut sit unus grex." He may have remembered an argument of Cyprian (*Ep.*, 69, 5), in which a good deal depends on the true reading.

A valuable Appendix contains a list of 163 quotations in *De Consensu*

where Augustine, differing from the Wordsworth-White edition, is supported by one or more, and sometimes many, of the principal manuscripts of the Vulgate. There may be a question whether the Oxford editors attached sufficient importance to these concurrences. But Augustine's mode of quoting was not conspicuously accurate. Mr. Milne mentions one interesting kind of variation. The student of the classics that he was shows an inclination to revert from the construction with *quia* to the more refined *oratio obliqua*. A good example is in John iv. 17, "Bene dixisti, non habere te uirum," where Jerome's "Bene dixisti, quia non habeo uirum" is an almost intolerable Semitism. Even the Old Latin softened the original to "Bene dixisti quia uirum non habes," which Augustine evidently remembers. T. A. Lacey.

Mysticism and the Eastern Church. By Nicholas Arseniew. S.C.M. 5s.

In Part I. of this work Professor Arseniew deals with *The Spirit of the Eastern Church*, showing that the keynote of the Eastern Church's outlook on the world is the joy of the resurrection. It is a "mood of exalted joy crystallized into an outlook on the world"; it is a "religious realism" thoroughly characteristic of the earliest Christianity." He proceeds to support this with a bewildering mass of quotations from the New Testament, the Fathers of the Church, and liturgical books—there are eighty-seven quotations in the first sixty pages. Then follows an account of the ritual of Holy Week and Eastertide to illustrate the glorification of life in the "sacrament of sacraments," with many long references to the *Oktoichos* (the book of liturgical hymns) and the *Philokalia*. In this connection the writer gives a thrilling story of the way a village priest brought a Bolshevist meeting to an abrupt termination. A Commissary for Popular Education, having delivered his lecture attacking the "obsolete faith," sat down feeling complete confidence in his success. A young village priest, shy and awkward, stepped forward. "Remember, not more than five minutes," said the lecturer. "Yes, certainly, I shall not take long." The priest mounted the platform, turned to the audience, and said: "Brothers and sisters, Christ is risen!" As one man the great audience answered: "Verily, He is risen!" "I have finished. I have no more to say," added the priest. The meeting was at once closed. The flowery eloquence of the lecturer availed him nothing. The Christian truth prevailed.

In Part II. the author deals with *The Transfiguration of the World and Life in Mysticism*, where he passes hurriedly before us "The Naturalism of the Ancients," Plato, Socrates, Plotinus, and others being called to witness. Then he treats of "The Gloomy Dualism of the Middle Ages and the Religious Outlook in the Mediæval West." He shows that the world of those days was transfigured by the religious experience of the great mystics, such as Francis of Assisi, Jacopone da Todi, Mother Julian, and others, who are the true examples of the fulness of the Christian spirit. There is rather a sketchy chapter on "The Christian Mystics of the Renaissance," which closes with a reference to Dostoievski, "Russia's greatest writer, the most relentless portrayer of the horrors of life," and yet one who has found a way out, a solution of the most oppressive problem of suffering, in the incarnate God.

The whole book is a personal impression rather than a treatise on Eastern Mysticism. The author reveals his own enthusiasm for a subject

about which he has clearly a wide knowledge. To him Mysticism is a soul-experience and not a modern discovery. It is the Mysticism of St. Paul, St. John, and of the New Testament. It is rooted in the incarnate Christ, and he finds it portrayed everywhere in the Eastern Liturgy. The Risen Christ is the joy of the Eastern Mystic, and the hope and faith, so characteristic of primitive Christianity, have ever remained dominant in the Eastern Church. The best chapter is that on "The Transfiguration of the World and of Life in the Eucharist." Here the author describes the personal mysticism of the great heroes of Christ, as finding its expression in collective Mysticism of Christianity, which appears in the practice of the Church and especially in the Lord's Supper. This is the glorification and sanctification of the earthly through the heavenly, displayed in the Eucharist, "the vital nerve of the Church's life." All that follows is a devotional commentary on the Eucharistic action, and is worthy of attention. Finally, we read, "Man and nature are glorified in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. The spirit of communion here finds its expression, the bond of brotherhood organically uniting in an act of prayer and praise all the faithful, both the living and departed, and the whole Church, heavenly and earthly, and, what is more, the whole of creation gathers round the head of the body, the Church, who is the Beginning, the first-born from the dead, the Prince of Life, the glorified Lord who is present in the eucharistic gifts." The various chapters in the book are of unequal value, but we expect we shall have something later from the same writer, when we hope to be introduced to original texts of Eastern Mystics at present inaccessible to Western students. The book has a preface by Professor Friedrich Heiler, and Miss Evelyn Underhill contributes an introductory note.

F. N. Heazell.

The Theology of Personality. By W. S. Bishop, D.D. Longmans. 5s.

In this volume Dr. Bishop tells us that the positions taken up in *Spirit and Personality* are amplified, illustrated, and reaffirmed. His former work received favourable notice in Theology (February, 1924). The present book consists mainly of articles reprinted from the *Expositor*, the *American Church Monthly*, and the *Anglican Theological Review*. We could wish that Dr. Bishop would produce a severely theological treatise on the theology of Personality. As it is, the title of the present work barely covers matter embedded in chapter after chapter of a more or less homiletic character, and it is difficult to discern any strictly logical development in thought between its varied sections. Chapter X., on a Trinity of Trinities, is promising, and the treatment of John of Damascus and Catholic theology in Chapter XII. leads us to hope that Dr. Bishop himself may yet make a contribution of some value to the rapidly accumulating material concerning the doctrine of the Blessed Trinity which reaches us from ancient and modern thought. We agree with him that there is need for a review and a reappraisement of the content of our Trinitarian doctrine which shall correspond with the advance of human thought in other departments of knowledge. Such a review will beyond question show that more than a single line of interpretation is necessary, if we are to have a grasp of this great truth which shall correspond with our increasing grasp upon the facts of the physical world about us, as well as of that inner world of psychology and introspection. Dr. Bishop's

earlier work on the development of Trinitarian Doctrine and these later studies show that he possesses that type of mind which can feel at home in Patristic thought, whilst at the same time being alert to its bearing upon the modern approach to the same problems. The contribution made by men like Athanasius, the Cappadocian Fathers, Tertullian, and the later Church teachers in East and West cannot be ignored in any attempt we make to-day to grapple with the great doctrines of the Incarnation and the Trinity.

We are glad to notice that Dr. Bishop has now traced the doctrine of Enhypostasia back to its source in the writings of Leontius of Byzantium, and we venture to hope that he may be led to pay some attention to the significance of that contribution in the attempt to discuss the theology of personality, human and Divine, in terms of modern thought.

H. Maurice Relton.

Life and Man. By T. A. Bowhay. London: Jonathan Cape. 9s.

This is a very thoughtful and sincere piece of work, fearless and independent; it requires, and will abundantly repay, careful and attentive reading. You may not always agree with Mr. Bowhay, especially regarding some elements of thought and practice which he excludes, but you are constantly kept in touch with the great issues with which, in this time of intellectual and spiritual reawakening, our souls are travailing. In the preface we are told that Mr. Bowhay's writing is dynamic and original: it is so, and it is well to be prepared. We are, however, also informed that this author "does not love the more orthodox manner of writing," and I fear that most readers will conclude that this undoubted fact does not operate either to their own advantage or to the expression of Mr. Bowhay's ideas. The almost complete absence of reference to the work of others who have been over the ground which the writer covers, and the fact that he shows to us very little of the processes of thought by which he arrives at his very definite and often very debatable conclusions, also add to the difficulty of a task which is great enough in any case.

We are informed, in the preface, that readers must not expect to understand this book except through "their own power of life"; the onus of failure to agree is thus thrown upon the reader, and this is further emphasized by the dictum—"When people say they understand, all they often mean is, 'My limited power of questioning is satisfied.'" It might be possible to take the very humble attitude of mind which is thus required were it not that so many others have claimed the same immunity for very different conclusions on the same grounds. Perhaps, after all, the "power of life" best exhibits its capacity when it obeys the instruction of one of the greatest of the prophets, "produce your cause; bring forth your strong reasons," and it may be that that requires use of "the more orthodox manner of writing." Nor is it unimportant to suggest this doubt both regarding the claims of intuition as distinct from the intelligence, and regarding departure from reasoned treatment of great problems.

The main thesis of the book, both in its exposition of the genius of religion and in its spiritual and personal appeal, is upon Christianity as "the revelation of a life as much above the ordinary human life as that is above the life of an animal." It might be regarded as a satisfactory defence of this thesis, were it not for an extraordinary limitation of its

applications and implications. When the writer dismisses St. Thomas à Kempis with something like contempt, making him an offender for a phrase which, perhaps, has been judged with imperfect sympathy, and when he rejects mysticism as "entirely emotional," he merely weakens our trust in his judgments on other points. The chapter on Mysticism shows that Mr. Bowhay confuses mystical insight with certain aberrations, and cuts the ground from under his own feet. For a more judicial estimate of the significance of mysticism in its relation with Mr. Bowhay's own theme, we must turn to Dom Cuthbert Butler and to Récéjac and Flournoy. And this consideration is vital for estimating the value of the book as a contribution to religious thought, for if insight gained through the power of spiritual life in St. John of the Cross and Ruysbroeck, with their keen intellectual vision, fails us, what are we to make of Mr. Bowhay's own affirmations on the same problems and tasks, and, confessedly, in virtue of "power of life"?

F. W. Butler.

From the Faith Press come two companion volumes:

The Rallying Centre of Christendom. By the Rev. C. E. Douglas. 2s. 6d.

The Diocesan Synod: some Chapters from the *De Synodo Diocesana* of Pope Benedict XIV., selected and done into English by W. R. V. Brade. 3s. 6d.

In these days, when so much is heard of the failure of the Church, and particularly of the Church of England, it is refreshing to find an ardent and outspoken believer in the likelihood of the Church of England proving to be the rallying centre of Christendom. Mr. Douglas is a doughty champion, and is never guilty of a dull page. Whoever reads the unconventional opening chapter with its "illustration" from the London Coliseum will, we feel sure, be carried on to the last page of the book, and be filled with the hope that it may be true that "only by proper synodical government can internal discipline be restored, can we take once more our place in the One, Holy, Catholic, Apostolic Church, can we hope to regain the confidence of English Nonconformity."

The companion volume is a translation by Mr. Brade of certain chapters from the treatise *De Synodo Diocesana* by the eighteenth-century Pope Benedict XIV. His Holiness was a very learned scholar and canonist, and Mr. Brade's translation is well done. The selection of chapters is judicious, though we think the decision to include the chapter from Book XI. one of very questionable wisdom or taste.

Mr. Douglas adds two appendices to the book which increase its usefulness as a book of reference—one on the Diocesan Synod in Anglo-Saxon times, the other on the value of Benedict's treatise in the revival of synodical government in the Church of England.

A. E. Smith.

Catholicism and Humanity. By the Rev. W. G. Peck. A. R. Mowbray and Co. 2s. 6d.

Mr. Peck has given us a preface describing the path by which he has reached his present ecclesiastical allegiance, and three lectures on the philosophy of Anglo-Catholicism. The preface is human and sincere, and the lectures give us plenty to think about. Mr. Peck's main thesis

is that Catholicism is the answer to the problem how to combine the claims of personality with those of society. There is no great originality in the treatment, but it is a very good specimen of the kind of thought which dominates modern Anglo-Catholicism, and especially of its renewed determination to find a spiritual solution for social problems.

THEOLOGY AND LIFE: SOME ASPECTS OF THE WORK OF THE CHRISTIAN MINISTRY IN THE MODERN WORLD. By various writers. Student Christian Movement. Cloth, 4s.; paper, 2s. 6d.

This book is a collection of the addresses given at an inter-denominational gathering of theological students. The addresses are nothing if not modern, audacious, stimulating, rather nervy. The series might perhaps be summed up in a sentence from Dr. Garvie's address: "The acid test of any theology is whether it can be preached." Mr. Pite makes the revolutionary suggestion that Sunday should be used by the clergy for "getting at" people, rather than for conducting so many services of worship. Mr. Conrad Noel's "acid test" is the industrial system. Fr. Kelly effectively disposes of ministerial complacency with the weapon of irony. Professor Barry concludes with a chastisement of the narrowly clerical mind. A book which will be good for the clergy, if a little bewildering to the seminarist.

ON HEARING CONFESSIONS. An abridged edition of Dr. Pusey's translation of the Abbé Gaume's Manual for Confessors. Arranged by Rev. Clifford Harris. Faith Press. 3s. 6d.

Mr. Harris has done a good work in republishing the most valuable portions of this famous translation. He has omitted Dr. Pusey's preface, which upholds a position now almost universally conceded, and has cut out all matter which seems unnatural or unnecessary in a book intended for Anglican confessors. There are few such who would not be benefited by being familiar with Gaume's deeply spiritual teaching, but it must not, of course, be supposed that this is a sufficient substitute for a text-book of moral theology. Such a textbook by an Anglican writer we still await.

K. D. MACKENZIE.

BOOK NOTES

Sharing in Creation. Studies in the Christian View of the World. By W. Cosby Bell, D.D. Allen and Unwin. 7s. 6d. These lectures "make no special claim to originality," says the author; but they certainly present the Christian philosophy of human co-operation with God with a wisdom, a directness, an honesty, and a fine consistency, which are far better for their purpose than any novelty of treatment. This is just the kind of eminently sane, plain-spoken, and well illustrated presentment of Christian philosophy which the ordinary educated reader needs to-day; and it is to be hoped that many will discover it and read it to their profit.

The Universal Faith. Comparative Religion from the Christian Standpoint. By N. H. Gowen, D.D. A. R. Mowbray and Co. 7s. 6d. Dr. Gowen's useful survey forms an admirable companion to Dr. Cosby

Bell's Bohlen Lectures. With a comprehensive and sympathetic knowledge of the world's religions, a sure grasp of Christian truth, and a power of presenting his material in broad touches with a pleasant literary flavour, he provides a sound historical and theological statement of the position on which all the missionary work of the Church must now be based. God has never left Himself without witness; and Christ is the consummation of whatever there is of truth in the whole course of man's religious development.

A Guide to the Epistles of St. Paul. By H. N. Bate. Longmans. 3s. 6d. and 5s. After three informing introductory chapters on St. Paul himself, Canon Bate conducts his readers through the thirteen epistles, from Galatians to 2 Timothy, with the clearness and orderliness of a teacher, and with an unusual capacity for brevity and interest combined. The book will prove a valuable guide for the student who is prepared to use it industriously with an open Bible. One matter of present importance can scarcely be said to receive adequate and satisfactory treatment—that of St. Paul's position in the matter of the ministry of women. As to those holding an official position in the Church, Phœbe, the deaconess, is fairly treated on p. 131, but finds no place in the index; and it occasions surprise to read that 1 Tim. iii. 11 refers, not to deaconesses, but to "the wives of deacons."

The Saints of Assisi. Francis and Clare, with Juniper and Giles, Friars Minor. By E. Salusbury. Burns Oates and Washbourne. 6s. *The Little Poor Man of Assisi.* By J. O. Dobson. S.C.M. 2s. 6d. and 3s. 6d. The modern cult of the Middle Ages is not without its dangers. But at least one feature of it deserves to be pressed, as it is being pressed in view of the seven hundredth anniversary of the death of St. Francis—viz., the study of the life of that most Christian saint. Books about him are multiplying rapidly, and, partly perhaps because of the simplicity and greatness of the subject, most of them show some merit and are attractively written. There is already no excuse for any who have failed to acquaint themselves with the story of the saint of Assisi. The former of the two books named above has the merits of keeping close to the earliest authorities, of reproducing something of their atmosphere, and of including with St. Francis three others whose life-stories are essential to a proper appreciation of the man they followed. Mr. Dobson's book is excellent in its portrait of the saint, in its vivid sketch of his times, and most of all in its concluding estimate of St. Francis and his importance for to-day.

The Names of Christ. Readings from *Nombres de Cristo*, by Fray Luis de Leon. Translated from the Spanish by a Benedictine of Stanbrook. Preface by Father Benedict Zimmerman, O.C.D. Burns Oates and Washbourne. 6s. Luis de Leon, the first editor of the writings of St. Teresa, and himself an author of distinction both in poetry and prose, is best known as a writer of prose by his *Names of Christ*, which appeared in 1583 and, in an amplified form, two years later. Three friends, who meet daily to discuss these Names at great length, provide much that is eloquent and beautiful, together with mystical passages which, while they seem at first to fall far below the level attained by the Carmelite saints, yet deserve close attention. In this edition the translator has made a selection from the three volumes of the Spanish edition of Federigo de Onis, published in 1921, omitting lengthy quotations from the Fathers and various parenthetical sections treating of the Jews and of certain ancient philosophers. The book is a very welcome addition to the work

that is being done, notably by Professor Peers, in opening up the treasures of Spanish mystical writings.

Worship. Its Necessity, Nature, and Expression. By A. L. Lilley. S.C.M. 2s. In four lectures, delivered at Cambridge in 1925 and now slightly revised, Archdeacon Lilley deals with the necessity, the object, the essence, and the expression of worship. The discussion is as admirable and illuminating as was the author's recent treatment of prayer; and it is especially to be welcomed for its full recognition of the two facts that worship, which is prior to belief, is the element which lends vitality to religion, and yet that the truth and the value of worship are conditioned by right belief.

The Divine Liturgy of our Father among the Saints. John Chrysostom. Greek Text, with Introduction and Notes by Dom Placid de Meester, O.S.B. English translation by the Benedictines of Stanbrook. Burns Oates and Washbourne. 2s. 6d. This well-printed volume testifies to the growing interest of members of the Roman communion in the Church of the East. Its contents are translated from the third edition of a work which was designed, not merely to meet and to stimulate the new interest in liturgical study, but to promote understanding and so to " hasten the time of doctrinal and hierarchic reunion." Twenty pages of useful notes and an index of liturgical terms add greatly to the value of the book.

O. HARDMAN.

WOLSEY'S WINCHESTER REGISTER (DIOCESIS WYNTONIENSIS REGISTRUM THOME WOLSEY). Canterbury and York Society, Part LXXVII. Oxford University Press.

The Canterbury and York Society still lacks the financial support which it deserves, and it is only the appropriate generosity of Cardinal College to wit, the Dean and the governing body of Christ Church, which has rendered possible the issue in full of the register which records Wolsey's association with the diocese of Winchester. Things do not always happen so aptly; but editors as well as financial supporters can sometimes do the right thing in the right way, and Canon F. T. Madge of Winchester Cathedral and Mr. Herbert Chitty of Winchester College have been as patriotic in their labour as they have been precise in its production.

So they have their reward, and they can get no other. For here, first, there is no personal touch to make dull things interesting. Wolsey constantly calls himself Bishop of Winchester in the course of these interminable documents; but he was so in no more real sense than the Medici Cardinal, afterwards Clement VII., was Bishop of Worcester. Both of them worked through agents, and made what they could in the time.

And, secondly, the task (even when many documents are wisely abbreviated in print) must have been wearisome on account of the growing verbosity of the jurists. In order to make sure that Ann Colte was duly appointed Abbess of Wherwell, the Cardinal's clerks needed a series of documents which now occupy twenty-eight printed pages, and the Oxford Press can get about 375 admirably printed words into a page. No doubt the poor abbess or her convent found that the costs were in proportion to the length.

Mr. Chitty supplies a brief but satisfying introduction.

ERNEST WORCESTER.

INDEX OF VOLUME XII

JULY—DECEMBER, 1926

PAGE

ADDERLEY, J. 136
BAKER, A. E. 2
BATIFFOL, P. 266
Books Reviewed:
Anglo-Catholic Revival, The. By S. L. Ollard 58
Apocalypse, The. By E. Lohmeyer 33
Behind the Third Gospel. By Vincent Taylor 46
Catholicisme et Papauté. By P. Batiffol 228
Church of England and the Free Churches, The. Edited by G. K. A. Bell . 182
Confirmation 343
Confusion of the Churches, The. By K. D. Mackenzie 231
Date of the Exodus, The. By J. W. Jack 175
English Mediæval Painted Glass. By J. D. Le Conteur 348
Essays Catholic and Critical 37, 266
Fifty-two Short Sermons. By G. White 119
Fourth Gospel, The. By P. V. Smith 120
Francesco Petrarca. By E. H. R. Tatham 341
God and Intelligence. By F. J. Sheen 116
History of England. By G. Trevelyan 63
How Natives Think. By L. Lévy-Bruhl 178
Ignatian Retreats. By W. H. Longridge 237
Impassibility of God, The. By J. K. Mozley, D.D. 350
Incarnation, The. Edited by C. Lattey 294
James Cooper. By H. J. Wotherspoon 297
Liddell and Scott, The New 167
Life and Man. By T. A. Bowhay 354
Life, Mind, and Spirit. By C. L. Morgan 114
Liturgical Psalter, The. By W. H. Frere 174
Midrash Sifre on Numbers. By P. P. Levertoff 176
Moral Theology, A Study in. By J. Laird 172
Mystical Phenomena. By A. Farges 168
Mysticism and the Eastern Church. By Nicholas Arseniew 352
Parish Priest, The. By J. G. H. Barry and S. P. Delany 178
Passing and Permanent in St. Paul, The. By H. Bulcock 55
People and the Book, The. Edited by A. S. Peake 106
Plato: The Man and His Work. By A. E. Taylor 337
Platonic Tradition, The. By W. R. Inge 61
Poetry of Our Lord, The. By C. F. Burney 289
Preaching in Mediæval England. By G. R. Ourst 298
Prophecy and Eschatology. By N. Micklem 57
Psalter in Life, Worship, and History. By A. C. Welch 300
Psychology and the Church. Edited by O. Hardman 110
Rabbinic Commentary. By Strack and Billerbeck 165
Reality in Worship. By W. L. Sperry 299
Religion and Natural Science. By E. Haigh 57
Religion and the Rise of Capitalism. By R. H. Tawney 241
Religious Experience. By K. Edward 173
Sacrifice in the O.T. By G. Buchanan Gray 49
St. Bernard of Clairvaux: Select Treatises. By W. W. Williams . . . 118
St. Francis de Sales, Life of. By H. Burton 56
Samaritans, The. By M. Gaster 170
Samuel I. and II. By W. H. Rigg 118
Short Notices 58, 238
Some Postulates of a Christian Philosophy. By H. M. Relton 52
Song of Mystery, The. By S. L. Christian 176
Stephen Gardiner. By J. A. Muller 92
Texts of the Gospels used by St. Augustine. By C. M. Milne. . . . 351
Theology of Personality, The 353
Thorns. By E. A. Bryans 238
To be Near unto God. By A. Kuyper 303
Two Glastonbury Legends. By J. Armitage Robinson 180
Vers la Foi Catholique, Vol. II. By P. Buysse 55
Via Mystica. By J. Brett 176

PAGE

Brilioth, Y. 280
Brother Masseot and Jalāluddīn Rūmī 146
Brook, V. J. K. 302
Bulgarkoff, S. 277
Burkitt, F. C. 147
Case for a One-Year Ministry, The 327
Church in France, The 21
Clarke, W. K. L. 33, 46, 78, 165, 211, 327, 334
Cooke, G. A. 106
Copernicus and Christianity 246
Correspondence 160, 217, 285
Dickey, Professor E. M. O'Rorke 318
Ecclesiastical Courts Commission 204, 258
Editorial 1, 61, 121, 181, 241, 301
Erskine Hill, E. 297
Franciscan Greeting, The 144
Franciscan Poverty 136
Gayford, S. C. 49
Gordon George, R. E. 21
Goudge, H. L. 37
Harris, C. 52
Haslehurst, R. S. T. 34
Henry Lowther Clarke 211
Housman, Laurence 125
Inge, W. R. 337
Kidd, B. J. 228
Lacey, T. A. 231
Lancelot Andrewes and English Church 147
Langford-James, R. H. 129
Leslie, A. 204, 258
Levertoff, P. P. 170
Mackenzie, K. D. 14
Marsh, H. L. 161
Mining Centre, From a 161
Miscellanea 31, 101, 160, 217, 285, 333
Mozley, J. K. 294
Mozley, J. R. 312
Nairne, A. 289
Nash, J. O. 246
Nes, W. H. 147
Notes on Periodicals 32, 101, 223
Ollard, S. L. 92
Prestige, L. 8
Reconciliation of Christendom, The 312
St. Francis and His Message 121
St. Francis the Man 125
St. Francis the Mystic 129
St. Francis' Seventh Centenary 286
St. Paul and Redemption 302
St. Peter in N.T. 66
St. Peter and St. Paul 190
Saints and Saintship, The 14
Scott, A. 273
Seton, W. 286
Some Pictures of St. Francis 318
Studies in Texts 335
Taylor, A. E. 114
Thouless, R. 110, 168
Tradition 8
Turner, C. 4, 66, 190
Value of O.T. 2
Virgin Birth and Recent Discussions, The 78
Whittaker, G. H. 335
Worcester, Bishop of 298

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY BILLING AND SONS, LTD., GUILDFORD AND ESHER